



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 111th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 155

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2009

No. 143

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SCHRADER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 6, 2009.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KURT SCHRADER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes and each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

HEALTH CARE PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to correct a misperception held by many in this Chamber and others throughout our great Nation. Members of my party claim that our colleagues across the aisle do not have a health care plan. Well, I'm here to break with my own caucus and say that's just not true. Our Republican friends do in fact have a plan.

Let me offer you some of their highlights. The plan so far offered by our

Republican colleagues would allow health care premiums to double over the next decade; add more than two-thirds to the out-of-pocket expenses for individuals and their families who watched helplessly as premiums and deductibles grew three times faster than their wages over the last decade; and push more families to the brink of financial ruin because they can no longer afford basic health care needs.

In my district alone, more than 1,400 people were forced into bankruptcy last year because of expenses not covered by health insurance.

It doesn't stop there, Mr. Speaker. Their plan would also allow insurance companies to continue racking up profits by denying coverage using capricious standards.

Insurance companies in 45 States would be allowed to continue discriminating based on preexisting conditions for those attempting to purchase insurance on the individual market. It's estimated that more than 12.6 million Americans have been denied coverage because of preexisting conditions already.

Insurance companies in eight States and the District of Columbia would be allowed to continue denying coverage to survivors of domestic violence because they classify history of such violence as a preexisting condition, which is a particularly egregious example of cherry-picking by insurance companies, considering October is Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Even those lucky enough to have health insurance will continue to find their coverage or their costs altered due to preexisting conditions, which affect up to 45 percent of us who already have health care insurance.

The Republican plan, or lack thereof, also will make it harder in the business community to continue meeting the needs of its workers and customers. A recent Kaiser Family Foundation study showed that 42 percent of em-

ployers are preparing to increase premiums next year; 39 percent of employers are preparing to increase out-of-pocket expenses for doctor visits next year; 37 percent of employers are preparing to increase out-of-pocket prescription drug costs next year; and 8 percent said they already have reached the tipping point and have decided to drop health care coverage altogether next year.

Mr. Speaker, small businesses in the Commonwealth of Virginia alone spent more than \$3 billion on health care premiums last year. That figure is expected to more than double to \$7.4 billion during the next decade if we do nothing.

Today, less than half of Virginia's small businesses offer health insurance to their employees, with three-fourths saying they're struggling to do so. The plan offered by our Republican colleagues would only exacerbate that situation and likely push more businesses into withdrawing health care coverage altogether.

But that's not what our businesses want. Not only do two-thirds of Virginia's small businesses say health care reform will play an important part in getting the economy back on track, but more than half of them also say they, themselves, have a responsibility to help provide coverage for their employees.

A majority of Americans—57 percent—say it's now more important than ever to reform our broken health care system. Unfortunately, the plan from our Republican colleagues amounts to “do nothing and hope for the best.” Well, we can't afford that plan. And, thankfully, Americans are starting to come to the same realization.

That same poll found that 57 percent of the public faults our Republican colleagues for opposing health care reform more for political reasons than substantive argument.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H10461

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford for premiums to climb 50 percent above the national poverty rate for a family of four. We cannot afford for more employers to pull the plug on providing health care coverage for their employees. We cannot afford to put even more families in the position of struggling to pay for basic needs like health care.

We must deliver reform that will make health care affordable and accessible; cap out-of-pocket expenses; stop the practice of cherry-picking based on preexisting conditions; and protect our small businesses from crippling costs.

We must deliver reform that will once again instill confidence in our Nation's health care system—and that is what we will do here in the House of Representatives this fall.

AMERICA NEEDS MORE JOBS, NOT MORE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A few days ago, the Labor Department released its monthly unemployment report. It was another month of bad news for unemployed Americans looking for work. In September, we lost 263,000 jobs and the unemployment rate rose to 9.8, a 26-year high. And, according to the Labor Department, the number of unemployed people now stands at 15.1 million.

This is an American tragedy. There are millions of breadwinners desperate for an opportunity to get back to work. But for far too many, these opportunities seem inaccessible. And Washington doesn't seem to get it.

Instead, it's business as usual here in Washington. Borrow and spend is Washington's prescription for our ailing economy. But Americans know that we cannot borrow and spend our way into prosperity. We've tried that already—and it didn't work.

Nevertheless, my Democrat colleagues insisted that passing a stimulus bill that borrowed another trillion dollars would create jobs "immediately" and unemployment would not rise above 8 percent. The facts tell another, more discouraging story.

More than 2.7 million jobs have been lost since the so-called stimulus was signed by President Obama. And the Labor Department keeps churning out these gloomy monthly unemployment reports. Today, there are about 12 million workers who would like to work full time but can't find a full-time job. U.S. auto sales plummeted in September and factory orders tumbled by the largest amount in 5 months.

The American people know that a true economic recovery starts with tax relief for American families and small businesses and fiscal discipline in Washington. After all, if American families have to buckle down and trim their budgets, Washington should, too. We can't keep running \$1.5 trillion defi-

cits and expect economic growth as a result.

House Republicans agree with the American people. Washington needs to rein in the runaway spending. For example, this week Congress is poised to pass an agriculture spending bill which includes a 14 percent increase in discretionary spending. There's plenty of good to be said about some of the spending in this bill, but its unrestrained increase in spending is emblematic of Washington's intractable, profligate habits.

We can find a way to live within our means and create real incentives for employers to create jobs and get people back to work. How about using what remains of the stimulus money to create a jobs tax credit for employers who take risks and put Americans back to work?

Such a tax credit could spur new job creation and help reinvigorate our battered economy. Plus, it keeps taxpayer money out of wasteful government programs and politicians' pet projects.

Until we start to consider such real solutions to our jobs deficit, I will continue to oppose the Democrats' job-killing tax-and-spend policies and support real solutions to get the American people back to work.

ON THE DALAI LAMA'S VISIT THIS WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOLF. The front page of the Washington Post yesterday featured a story about the Dalai Lama's visit to Washington this week—a trip which will be marked by what doesn't take place. For the first time since 1991, this spiritual leader, a Nobel Peace Prize recipient, will not be afforded a meeting with the President of the United States. This is a mistake which has far-reaching consequences.

China has initiated a global effort to stop heads of state from hosting the Dalai Lama. As the Wall Street Journal editorial page pointed out yesterday, "China routinely assails countries whose leaders meet with the Dalai Lama, targeting France and Germany in recent years by cutting off diplomatic exchanges and canceling conferences and the like."

The Dalai Lama is set to travel to New Zealand and Australia later this year and, as the Post reported, "he has yet to secure a commitment from their leaders to meet." Will these countries follow our lead?

I've been to Tibet. I've seen the Buddhist monks and nuns in Drapchi prison. I've met frightened Tibetans who quietly showed me their forbidden photo of the Dalai Lama. I wonder if their plight received even passing mention during internal White House deliberations about whether to meet with the Dalai Lama before the President's November trip to China. Or, were they simply a nuisance in the context of a larger bilateral relationship?

An unnamed administration official in the Post story justified the decision by saying "this President is not interested in symbolism or photo ops but in deliverables." I, too, am interested in deliverables, as is the human rights community, but I'm interested in symbols. And the President should be, too. Symbolism is powerful. If we surrender to this Chinese government, we have surrendered something far greater than the President may realize.

The Tiananmen Square demonstrators of 20 years ago understood that symbols speak volumes. They carried papier-mache models of the Statue of Liberty. Ronald Reagan, too, understood symbols. He understood there was something symbolically stirring about him standing at the Brandenburg Gate and calling on the then-Soviet leader to tear down that wall that divided the people of East and West Berlin.

Ronald Reagan understood there was something symbolically powerful about invoking the name of Solzhenitsyn when he spoke at the Danilov Monastery in Russia—the very same dissident who more than a decade earlier, reminiscent of this week's events, was denied a visit with President Ford who was worried about upsetting the Russians prior to a summit.

This administration may not be interested in symbolism, but that will come as devastating, devastating news to millions around the world who yearn for freedom, who cry out for basic human rights, and who expect America, our country, to be their champion when their own voices have been silenced.

What about the Coptic Christians in Egypt? The Baha'is in Iran? What about the oppressed citizens of Burma and North Korea and Vietnam? They should rightly be alarmed by the treatment of the Dalai Lama, as this is just one more example of a growing pattern in this administration of sidelining human rights.

It's not too late. I call on the President to invite the Dalai Lama to the White House; to reclaim the moral high ground and not kowtow to the Chinese government that brutally oppresses its people.

I call on the President to stand side by side with his holiness—a man of peace—and align America once again with the oppressed, not with the oppressors.

MOJAVE DESERT VETERANS MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) for 2 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the United States Supreme Court will soon hear arguments in the case of *Salazar v. Buono*, which may determine the future of memorials all across the country that honor those who fought and died for our Nation. The center of this case is a memorial in my

district known as the Mojave Desert Cross, which has stood proudly for over 75 years. It was erected by veterans of World War I and maintained by generations of veterans since 1934.

It was attacked 10 years ago by the ACLU, which convinced a judge to declare the memorial to World War I veterans unconstitutional. Clearly, they want to erase anything from public property that might be seen as religious in some way.

The monument was not established by government or maintained by the government, but it now stands in the Mojave National Preserve. It is a tribute to those who protected America and freedom, not a promotion of religion. If the critics of this memorial are successful, it could open the door to attacks on memorials and historic sites in all of our national parks, including Arlington National Cemetery and Gettysburg National Military Park.

I am proud to say that the Congress has understood the value of these materials and has voted overwhelmingly on numerous occasions to preserve the Mojave Desert Cross in honor of those who have defended our Nation. The will of Congress is to keep the cross in tribute to all veterans—and I sincerely hope the Justices will see the wisdom of that intent.

FEDERAL REGULATORS MISLED DURING BAILOUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to address my concerns as a result of the Special Inspector General for the Troubled Asset Relief Program's audit of the capital injections provided to Bank of America and other major banks through the taxpayer-funded TARP program.

Neil Barofsky, the Special Inspector General for the TARP, revealed yesterday in his official report that high-ranking Federal officials, including former Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson and current Federal Reserve Chairman Ben Bernanke, misled the American people about the true financial state of Bank of America and eight other initial TARP recipients that received over \$125 billion in this bailout.

We were told last October that the Treasury Department needed over \$700 billion, along with unprecedented and vast new authority, in order to stave off a total collapse of our financial system. They were going to buy the so-called toxic loans. Ten days later, after the bill passed, they changed their strategy and decided to give TARP funds to financial institutions.

We were told last October that this \$700 billion would enable the Secretary of Treasury to go and restore liquidity and stability and to our financial system through a series of capital injections into these financial institutions. And, most importantly, we were told last October that the Federal Govern-

ment was going to inject this money into "healthy" financial institutions under the rationale that propping up these "healthy" banks would enable them to lend money and unfreeze the credit market so that none of the other major banks and private financial institutions would collapse. Almost exactly a year later, we have found out that the American people were not given the full truth.

The nine initial TARP recipients, which received \$125 billion in TARP funds, were actually not the stable, healthy institutions that Mr. PAULSON and Mr. Bernanke claimed they were. And, as we all well know today, none of these institutions were able to increase their lending activities.

□ 1245

Bank of America and Citigroup, in particular, actually ended up needing billions more in bailout money than they were initially given. Meanwhile, struggling financial institutions such as Merrill Lynch, which was on the verge of collapse months before the enactment of TARP, were largely ignored until the now infamous and coerced acquisition of Merrill Lynch by the not-so-healthy Bank of America.

Neil Barofsky's audit blankly states that "By stating expressly that the 'healthy' institutions would be able to increase overall lending, Treasury may have created unrealistic expectations about the institutions' condition and their ability to increase lending." The Federal Reserve, along with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, also described the nine original TARP recipients as "healthy." Privately, however, other Federal regulators and government officials were concerned that some of these institutions were actually in a state of near financial collapse, bankruptcy. These institutions collectively held more than \$11 trillion in banking assets, or about 75 percent of total U.S. bank assets, as of mid 2008.

Special Inspector General Neil Barofsky's audit concludes that "government officials should be particularly careful, even in a time of crisis, of describing their actions in an accurate manner" and that "inaccurate statements could have unintended long-term consequences that could damage the trust that the American people have in their government." Unfortunately, the real damage has already been done. The American people continually put their trust in high-ranking Federal officials to do what is best for the good of the people in our country. However, the reality is that most Americans, including the majority of my constituents in the Sixth Congressional District of Florida, were already and still continue to be outraged by the \$700 billion bailout of Wall Street.

Finding out that they were also misled about the rationale and the criteria in which the Treasury Department, the Federal Reserve and other Federal reg-

ulators selected Bank of America and eight other institutions to be the first recipients of taxpayer-funded TARP money does nothing to lessen the concern or infuse confidence into the future decision surrounding financial regulatory reform. Many Americans these days feel like Washington is the problem, not the solution. This is an unfortunate perception that must be changed. Trust in our Federal regulators must be restored in the American people's minds for, as Thomas Jefferson once said, "Follow truth as the only safe guide and eschew error, which bewilders us in one false consequence after another."

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. RICHARDSON) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

Pastor Greg Schanep, Faith Fellowship, Fort Hood, Texas, offered the following prayer:

As a Christian pastor, it is an honor to be here to pray for you in the name of my Lord, Jesus Christ.

President Abraham Lincoln said, "I have been driven many times upon my knees by the overwhelming conviction that I had nowhere else to go. My own wisdom, and that of all about me, seemed insufficient for that day."

Dear God, we pray for our President today and for his wisdom and for the wisdom of those about him. May they know Your grace is sufficient for this day.

We pray for the Members of the House of Representatives, their staffs and their families.

We ask that they be men and women of strong character with sound morality, and people of principle who share a strong vision of a godly Nation with a bright future.

We pray that our leaders will lead with compassion and love, and be forever aware of their huge responsibility to the people of this Nation and of their greater responsibility to You.

We ask Your watchful care over our men and women in uniform—especially those in harm's way and their families.

And, please God, Bless America.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the

last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. MCCOLLUM led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

HONORING PASTOR GREGORY SCHANNAP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about my friend and the leader of the prayer here in the House of Representatives today, Greg Schannep. Greg Schannep actually works for me as my regional director and my liaison to Fort Hood. He retired from the United States Army as chief of chaplains at Fort Hood, Texas, which is the largest military installation on Earth. He had over 90 chaplains that worked under him.

He started off his life in the Army as an enlisted man, ended up his career after 2 years in the Army as a Special Forces sergeant. Then the Lord called him, and after going back to school and becoming a minister, he served 28 years in the United States Army as a chaplain. That totals 30 years of active duty as a soldier for the United States.

He's worked for me almost 5 years—it will be 5 years in January—as my liaison to the military and as a regional director on our behalf.

Greg is a family man. He's got a beautiful wife and wonderful kids: Melissa, Sarah, Alison, Amy, James and Samantha. His hobbies are golf and grandchildren, of which he has four. And he has just recently—in fact, within the last 6 weeks—he has decided to start another church and come out of retirement and become a full-time builder of a church, and he started a church in Bell County known as Faith Fellowship. I went to the first service that Chaplain Schannep performed as Pastor Schannep, and he did a pretty darn good job.

He is a loved member of our community, and I am proud to call him my friend.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 5, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, The Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 5, 2009, at 9:37 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 42.
That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 43.
With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 6, 2009.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, The Capitol, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 6, 2009, at 9:42 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3663.

That the Senate passed S. 251.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 178.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

LORRAINE C. MILLER,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Friday, October 2nd, 2009:

S. 1707, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2010 through 2014 to promote an enhanced strategic partnership with Pakistan and its people, and for other purposes.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO THE RONALD REAGAN CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 4 of the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission Act of 2009 (P.L. 111-25), and the order of the House of January 6, 2009, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the Ronald Reagan Centennial Commission:

Mr. FOSTER, Illinois
Mr. MOORE, Kansas

CONCERN WITH HEALTH CARE REFORM MIRRORS CONCERN WITH BIG GOVERNMENT

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, the American people are not in favor of a government takeover of their health care. They have a real and legitimate concern about giving Washington power over something so personal.

The American people are not just concerned about Big Government intrusion; they're concerned that the government has already grown too big, too powerful, and too costly. Senior citizens will be squeezed, and the National Federation of Independent Business—the voice of small business—warns 1.6 million jobs will be lost. There remains a massive and growing debt threatening to devalue the dollar as it is kicked to future generations.

We must not sacrifice another part of our society to the control of government. Let's pursue targeted reforms to make health insurance portable, affordable, and available across State lines for families and small businesses regardless of preexisting conditions.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

THE NEW YORK TIMES IS OUT OF TOUCH WITH REALITY, AGAIN

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the New York Times has again lost touch with reality. In its latest immigration-related editorial, it actually refers to illegal immigrants as "would-be Americans." Never mind many illegals don't want to be Americans but just want the benefits of being here. And what an insult to the millions of jobless U.S. citizens and legal immigrant workers in our country and the millions of "would-be legal immigrants" who don't violate the law to come here.

The Times, in its elitist mentality, suggests that it is wrong for a company to fire 1,800 illegal workers in the United States. The Times forgot it's wrong for the company to knowingly hire 1,800 illegal immigrants in the first place, and it's wrong that the government did not arrest and deport them and then arrest the employer. Taking 1,800 illegal workers out of the workforce opens jobs for citizens and legal immigrants, as we have seen before.

Apparently, the New York Times cares more about illegal immigrants who violate the law than unemployed American workers who are looking for jobs.

And that's just the way it is.

GALLUP POLL FINDS AMERICANS DON'T TRUST MEDIA

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, by overwhelming margins, Americans say they do not trust the national media and that the media are too liberal, according to a new Gallup poll. Gallup found that just 1 in 10 Americans have a "great deal of confidence in the media to report the news fully, accurately, and fairly."

By a margin of 3-1, Americans said the media are too liberal rather than too conservative. Even most Democrats describe the media as "too liberal" rather than "too conservative."

This is the third poll released in the last month that has found Americans don't trust the media. The national media should recognize Americans' distrust and report the facts, not tell them what to think.

WHAT HAPPENED TO AUGUST?

(Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, what happened to August? August seems to have been lost in the Democratic Caucus; August seems to have been lost with the Democratic leadership; August seems to have been wiped out at the White House.

If you listen to the discussions that are taking place now about the health care bill that may be presented to us, there's something left out: it's the voice of the people that we heard in August. They told us loudly and clearly they did not want a public option. They told us loudly and clearly they didn't want a Democratic plan; they didn't want a Republican plan. No, Madam Speaker, they want an American plan—one that we can all rally around, one that takes into consideration what they told us in August, what they told us in September, and what they're telling us in October.

This is the U.S. House of Representatives. Let us represent the people of America.

HONORING STAFF SGT. ERIC COWIN FOR HIS SERVICE

(Mr. BOOZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my gratitude for Pastor Dr. Robin Cowin and the congregation at First Baptist Church in Gentry, Arkansas, for the wonderful work they are doing spreading the good news of the Gospel. This past Sunday, I had the pleasure of attending a service at the church and honor the sacrifice, service, and celebration of the homecoming of Staff Sergeant Eric Cowin.

Serving in the Army for the last 6 years, Eric was on his second tour in Iraq when he was injured in an IED explosion in Baghdad in June. Now he is undergoing rehabilitation at Brooke

Army Medical Center in San Antonio, and is in good spirits and on the road to recovery.

Eric is representative of so many American soldiers who have served this country honorably, stepping up to protect its citizens and people all around the world. I am grateful for the sacrifices Eric and all of our troops are making every day and for the hardships that they, as well as their families, face.

I wish Eric and his wife, Andrea, the best of luck in the future. Eric, you're a true American hero. I ask my colleagues to keep Eric in their hearts and minds as he goes through rehabilitation and all of our American troops in their thoughts and prayers.

□ 1415

"WHITE COAT" MONDAY AT THE WHITE HOUSE

(Mr. GINGREY of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGREY of Georgia. Madam Speaker, residents in our Nation's Capital have been in for a real treat over this past week. First was free T-Shirt Day at Nationals Stadium. But it got even better because yesterday, apparently, was Free White Coat Day at the White House.

Look at this photo. The administration is actually giving out the white coats.

Madam Speaker, the free white coats were for President Obama's publicity stunt with a handful of medical professionals, where he touted doctor support of his health care plan.

As a practicing physician for over 30 years, I can assure the President that the majority of physicians in this country are for health care reform, just not the government-run reform that he prefers. I wish he had taken the time to talk to the thousands of physicians who have traveled to Washington, or the millions of patients who attended town hall meetings in August to share their concerns about government-run health care, or even the 12 Republican physicians in this House who have contacted him about a meeting to share their concerns.

Madam Speaker, if these voices are not enough to get his attention, maybe my white coat will.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY WEEK

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 707) expressing support for designation of the week of September 13, 2009, as Adult Education and Family Literacy Week, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 707

Whereas the literacy of its citizens is essential for the economic well-being of the United States, our society, and the individuals who can benefit from full participation therein;

Whereas literacy and education skills are a prerequisite to individuals reaping the full benefit of opportunities in the United States;

Whereas the economy and our position in the world marketplace depend on having a literate, skilled population;

Whereas the education skills of parents and reading to children have a direct impact on the educational success of their children;

Whereas, parental involvement is a key predictor of a child's success, the level of parental involvement increases as the education level of the parent increases;

Whereas parents in family literacy programs become more involved in their children's education and gain the tools necessary to obtain a job or find better employment;

Whereas, as a result, children's lives become more stable, and success in the classroom, and in all future endeavors, becomes more likely;

Whereas studies show that two important factors that influence student achievement are the mother's education level and poverty in the home, it is clear that if adults are not part of the learning equation, then there is no long-term solution to our Nation's education challenges;

Whereas many older people in the United States lack the reading, math, or English skills to read a prescription and follow medical instructions, endangering their lives and the lives of their loved ones;

Whereas many individuals who are unemployed, underemployed, or receive public assistance lack the literacy skills to obtain and keep a job with a family-sustaining income, continue their education, or participate in job training programs;

Whereas many high school dropouts do not have the literacy skills to complete their education, transition to postsecondary education or vocational training, or become employed;

Whereas a large portion of those in prison have low educational skills, and prisoners without skills are more likely to return to prison once released;

Whereas many of our Nation's immigrants do not have the literacy skills to succeed in their new home country;

Whereas the National Assessment of Adult Literacy reports that 90,000,000 adults lack the literacy, numeracy, or English language skills to succeed at home, in the workplace, and in society;

Whereas National Adult Education and Family Literacy week highlights the need for our government to support efforts to ensure each and every citizen has the necessary literacy skills to succeed at home, at work, and in society; and

Whereas the week of October 18, 2009, would be an appropriate date to designate as National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week, including raising public awareness about the importance of adult education and family literacy;

(2) encourages people across the United States to support programs to assist those in need of adult education and family literacy programs; and

(3) requests that the President issue a proclamation recognizing the importance of adult education and family literacy programs, calling upon the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, libraries, nonprofit organizations, community-based organizations, consumer advocates, institutions of higher education, labor unions, and businesses to support increased access to adult education and family literacy programs to ensure a literate society.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 707 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 707, a bill that supports the designation of the week of October 18 as Adult Education and Family Literacy Week.

Adult education and family literacy programs provide millions of Americans with the skills they need to lead productive lives, boost their academic achievements, and engage in the workforce and earn a living. Adult Education and Family Literacy Week recognizes the impact that adult education and family literacy programs have on our Nation's adult learners and their families in the next generation.

According to the National Assessment of Adult Literacy, there are approximately 90 million adults nationwide who lack the literacy skills to reach their full potential. Approximately 30 million of these individuals are at the lowest rudimentary levels of literacy.

Adult education programs work with these individuals as well as new immigrants striving to learn English, to help them gain and retain jobs, transition to postsecondary education or a training program, read to their own children, and fully participate in their own education and obtain the English language skills necessary to succeed in their new home country. These programs emphasize basic skills such as reading, writing, math, English language competency, and problem-solving techniques.

It is important to recognize that the supply of adult education and family

literacy services has lagged significantly behind the growing demand. In my home State of Colorado, an estimated 585,000 adults, or 18 percent of the State's population over 16 years of age, have not attained a high school diploma or equivalent and are not enrolled in school. Yet in school year 2007–2008, adult literacy programs have provided slots for less than 15,000 individuals, 79 percent of whom were between the ages of 19 and 44. More than half of the participants were unemployed, and more than two in three of those served were Latino.

At over 100 sites around the State, our critical programs provide adult basic education, adult secondary education and English as a second language to Colorado's most-in-need population, helping adult learners and their families to break the cycle of illiteracy and move toward self-sufficiency. In the 2007–2008 school year, 2,500 students earned their high school diploma or GED and almost 10,000 adults received English as a second language services.

Family literacy programs work with parents without a high school diploma or GED and their young children to help break cycles of illiteracy and poverty that plague some of our Nation's most vulnerable families. Most importantly, they provide parents with the knowledge and skills they need to be their child's first and most important teacher and role model and to be full participants in their child's education. For children, family literacy programs help ensure that they start school ready to learn and on an equal footing with their peers.

In Colorado's Second Congressional District, which I have the honor of serving, the Boulder Valley Family Literacy Program, in partnership with the Boulder Valley School District, operates a high-quality adult and family literacy program for low-level literacy adult learners and limited English speakers, both adults and children; 160 learners and families attend the program together, interacting in literacy activities as they learn. Parents participate in English classes or GED preparation and learn more about the public school system offers and how best to support their child. Schoolchildren receive homework tutoring and enrichment, and preschool children learn the skills they need to start their formal education.

Also in my district, the Colorado Mountain College has several satellite campuses serving 2,300 students. Most of their learners are ESL students, and their goal is to provide them with a pathway to college wherever possible.

Effective adult education and family literacy programs improve adults' lives by helping them develop a basic yet strong understanding of the English language. These skills lead to jobs, workforce readiness, higher education and successful outcomes in life. Furthermore, adult literacy contributes to self-sufficiency for adults and families across the Nation.

Again, I want to express my strong support for this resolution. I urge my colleagues to endorse this measure by voting "yes."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of the resolution before us, House Resolution 707, expressing support for the designation of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Week.

According to a June 2008 report of the National Commission on Adult Literacy, among the 30 OECD free-market countries, the U.S. is the only Nation where young adults are less educated than the previous generation. In the current U.S. labor force, more and more workers are required to have at least some postsecondary education or occupational training. By one set of measures, more than 88 million adults have at least one major educational barrier: no high school diploma, no college degree or English-as-a-second-language needs. Because of these educational barriers, a number of working-age adults may fall behind in their efforts to get higher-wage jobs or to qualify for the college courses or job training that will help them advance in their current jobs.

Studies also show that two important factors that influence student achievement are a mother's education level and poverty in the home. Parents in family literacy programs may become more involved in their children's education and gain the tools necessary to obtain a job or find better employment.

The National Assessment of Adult Literacy reports that 90 million adults lack the literacy, numeracy or English language skills to succeed at home, in the workplace and in society. By designating an Adult Education and Family Literacy Week, we can encourage people across the United States to support programs to assist those in need of adult education and family literacy programs.

I stand in support of designating National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week in order to raise public awareness about the importance of adult education and of family literacy.

I ask for my colleagues' support.

I yield such time as she may consume to my colleague from Tennessee, MRS. BLACKBURN.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I do rise in support of Adult Education and Family Literacy Week.

I would like to begin by quoting one of my predecessors, a former Member from Tennessee who, while often my friends from Texas like to claim him as theirs, I think he was ours first, and that is Sam Houston. Congressman Houston said, "The benefits of education and of useful knowledge, generally diffused through a community, are essential to the preservation of a free government."

This week is our opportunity to enhance the preservation of that liberty

by turning a very careful eye to adult education and family literacy. As I have before in this Chamber, I would like to highlight the accomplishments of my friend and constituent, Gretchen Wilson.

Gretchen was one of 43 million American adults who had not completed high school. Inspired by her young daughter, she earned her high school degree later in life. She knew that literacy was more than just knowing how to read and write. After all, she was already a Grammy Award winning artist. Literacy is also the implementation of that skill which empowers people with worlds of new information. It is the spark that ignites curiosity.

Gretchen knew how precious that spark of curiosity could be. The children of parents who have not completed high school are far more likely to drop out themselves. Indeed, children's literacy levels are strongly linked to the educational levels of their parents, especially to the levels of their mothers. Gretchen knew that her education was also her daughter's education.

In so many cases like Gretchen Wilson's, that spark of curiosity has grown into a desire to give back. She, like so many others who have benefited from adult education, now works to expand that benefit to others.

I will close by quoting Thomas Jefferson, whose words on the matter are more eloquent than mine could ever be, and he stated, "Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppression of body and mind will vanish like evil spirits at the dawn of day."

Mr. HONDA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H. Res. 707 and for designating the week of September 13, 2009 as Adult Education and Family Literacy Week.

I commend Representative JARED POLIS, sponsor of the resolution, and the House Education and Labor Committee for recognizing the importance of literacy among adults and families, particularly in relation to the economic well being of these individuals.

Having been an educator for over 30 years, I am keenly aware that education and literacy are crucial to helping individuals achieve economic success. It has been shown that parental involvement is a key indicator to a child's success, and parental engagement increases as educational attainment increases.

Sadly, however, many over 90 million adults in the United States lack the literacy, numeracy, or English language skills needed to succeed at home, in the workplace, and in society. These adults are unable to be involved in their children's education, which perpetuates the cycle of illiteracy.

Of this group, here are still over 54.8 million people who speak a language other than English at home. According to the Census Bureau, between 2000 and 2005, the native-born Limited English Proficient population nearly doubled, and it is increasing at a higher rate than the immigrant population. In spite of this growth, there continue to be 1- to 3-year waitlists for English literacy education in many areas, leaving employers and communities with opportunities to invest in the education of their workforce.

As we work to address adult education and family literacy, we remember the need to extend literacy and education programs to new populations to help them fully integrate into our society. To help achieve this goal, I introduced H.R. 3249, the Strengthen and Unite Communities with Civics Education and English Skills Act of 2009. H.R. 3249 seeks to provide individuals with civics education and basic education programs and assist local communities in this integration process through impact aid and community-based solutions. This legislation will also provide businesses with tax credits for providing English-as-a-second-language programs to their employees, incentivize teachers with tax credits when they teach English Language Learners, and authorize more funding for such instruction.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H. Res. 707 and the laudable goal of designating the week of September 13, 2009 as Adult Education and Family Literacy Week. The resolution encourages people across the United States to support programs to assist those in need of adult education and family literacy programs, and I urge my colleagues to do so not only by supporting the resolution, but also by supporting the Strengthen and Unite Communities with Civics Education and English Skills Act of 2009, which would forge productive dialogues in our country about newcomers and provide real and concrete solutions to our communities by giving them the means and resources to help families learn English and integrate into U.S. society.

Mr. WAMP. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H. Res. 707, which seeks to designate the week of September 13, 2009, as National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week and to raise the awareness of adult literacy programs. I am also a cosponsor of this resolution.

Education spans from conception to the grave. Earning a high-school diploma makes people better qualified for the work force, for raising a family, and for improving their standard of living. For those who were unable to complete their education in their youth, adult education programs can provide a second chance.

Unfortunately, according to a 2005 study by the National Assessment of Adult Literacy, 45 percent of all adults function below the high school reading level. For these adults, it is much harder to get a good job that can sustain them or their family. Sadly, when faced with this reality, some adults turn to crime. The more than 1 million incarcerated adults in the Nation had lower average literacy scores than adults in households on nearly every comparable scale—age, gender, and ethnicity.

The inability to read not only affects individuals' lives but also the lives of their family. Children of parents who are unemployed and have not completed high school are five times more likely to drop out than children of employed parents. In turn, parents who can read are more likely to be employed full time and receive a higher income. When parents can read, especially the mother, they will be more involved in their children's lives. They will read to their children and discuss school topics.

The importance of education and the ability to read doesn't end with the family. Its benefit also helps improve the community and even saves us all money in the long run. Putting that 2005 study into real terms, 93 million

adults can't read or follow medical instructions. Individuals with limited literacy skills are more likely to have chronic conditions and are less able to manage them effectively or be aware of preventive care. These individuals will make greater use of emergency room and hospital services and less use of services designed to prevent health complications. Greater use of the emergency room raises health care costs for all of us.

In addition, American businesses lose more than \$60 billion in productivity each year due to employees' basic skill deficiencies. For our country to remain competitive in the global market place, more and more jobs will require advanced skills, and public schools produce only 2 percent of the workforce annually. Without adult education programs, important jobs could go unfilled holding back development or, worse yet, the jobs will go abroad to other nations.

Madam Speaker, literacy and education benefit so many aspects of our lives. I encourage my colleagues in the House to support this resolution and to raise the awareness of adult and family education programs.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 707 "Expressing support for designation of the second week of September as Adult Education and Family Literacy Week." The literacy of American citizens is essential for the economic well-being of our great Nation and I strongly believe that families play an important role in promoting and enabling learning at all levels.

Illiteracy is the root of many problems in our lives today. For example, in my home district, the 18th District of Texas approximately 68 percent of those arrested, 75 percent of welfare dependants, 85 percent of dropouts, and 72 percent of the unemployed are identified as functionally illiterate, Youth Plus. One in three adults in the greater Houston metropolitan area functions at the lowest level of literacy: They are unable to read and comprehend a menu or a street map, fill out a job application, or read the directions on a medicine bottle, Literacy Advance of Houston. And in Texas, 85 percent of teenagers appearing in juvenile court are functionally illiterate, Youth Plus.

No skill is more crucial to our future, nor to a democratic and prosperous society, than literacy. Basic literacy skills are the premise of reaching one's full potential as an upstanding citizen. President Lyndon B. Johnson once said, "A book is the most effective weapon against intolerance and ignorance," in order for us to utilize this priceless weapon, we must educate our citizens.

The education skills of parents along with reading to children have a direct impact on the educational success of their children. Parental involvement is an intricate part of a child's success and as the level of parental involvement increases the education level of the parent increases. Parents in family literacy programs have proven to become more involved in their children's education and gain the tools necessary to obtain a job or find better employment.

Advocating literacy across America will result in children's lives becoming more stable, leading to higher achievement in the classroom, and success in all future endeavors becomes inevitable. Studies have shown that two important factors that influence student achievement are the mother's education level

and poverty in the home. It is clear that if adults are not part of the learning equation, then there is no long-term solution to our Nation's education challenges.

The National Assessment of Adult Literacy reports that 90 million adults lack the literacy, numeracy, or English language skills to succeed at home, in the workplace, and in society. National Adult Education and Family Literacy week would highlight the need for our government to support efforts to ensure each and every citizen has the necessary literacy skills to succeed at home, at work, and in society. I support the designation of National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week, which encourages people across the United States to support programs to assist those in need of adult education and family literacy programs. I call upon the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, libraries, nonprofit organizations, community-based organizations, consumer advocates, institutions of higher education, labor unions, and businesses to support increased access to adult education and family literacy programs to ensure a literate society.

Mr. POLIS. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin have any additional speakers?

Mr. PETRI. I have no additional speakers and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 707, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SUPPORTING CAMPUS FIRE SAFETY MONTH

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 167) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives supporting the goals and ideals of Campus Fire Safety Month, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 167

Whereas each year, States across the Nation formally proclaim September as Campus Fire Safety Month;

Whereas since January 2000, at least 129 people including students, parents, and children, have died in student housing fires, many of which were preventable;

Whereas over 80 percent of these deaths have occurred in off-campus occupancies;

Whereas a majority of the students across the Nation live in off-campus occupancies;

Whereas a number of fatal fires have occurred in buildings where the fire safety systems have been compromised or disabled by the occupants;

Whereas it is recognized that automatic fire alarm systems provide the necessary early warning to occupants and the fire department of a fire so that appropriate action can be taken;

Whereas it is recognized that automatic fire sprinkler systems are a highly effective method of controlling or extinguishing a fire in its early stages, protecting the lives of a building's occupants;

Whereas many students are living in off-campus occupancies, Greek housing, and residence halls that are not adequately protected with automatic fire sprinkler systems and automatic fire alarm systems;

Whereas it is recognized that fire safety education is an effective method of reducing the occurrence of fires and reducing the resulting loss of life and property damage;

Whereas students are not routinely receiving effective fire safety education throughout their entire college career;

Whereas it is vital to educate the future generations of our Nation about the importance of fire safety behavior so that these behaviors can help to ensure their safety during their college years and beyond; and

Whereas by developing a generation of firesafe adults, future loss of life from fires can be significantly reduced: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Campus Fire Safety Month;

(2) encourages administrators and municipalities across the country to provide educational programs to all students during September and throughout the school year; and

(3) encourages administrators and municipalities to evaluate the level of fire safety being provided in both on- and off-campus student housing and take the necessary steps to ensure firesafe living environments through fire safety education, installation of fire suppression and detection systems, and the development and enforcement of applicable codes relating to fire safety.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I request 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend and insert extraneous material on House Resolution 167 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 167, which supports the goals and ideals of Campus Fire Safety Month.

Madam Speaker, college campuses host our students as they study and provide a safe place for them to live as they do so. But all too often we are devastated by tragic events that take place on campuses. The Center for Campus Fire Safety reports that 129

people have died in student housing fires since January of 2000. Almost 80 percent of the fire fatalities have occurred in off-campus occupancies such as rented houses and apartments.

Common factors in a number of these fires include lack of automatic sprinklers, disabled smoke alarms, careless disposal of smoking materials, and alcohol consumption. In many instances, the death of students, children and faculty members caused by campus fires could have been easily prevented with proper safety technology and appropriate fire safety student training.

As recently as 2008, fires on the campuses of UCLA and Plattsburgh State University resulted in deaths.

Fortunately, Congress has taken important steps to address these devastating occurrences. The recently enacted Higher Education Act requires each higher education institution to publish an annual fire safety report that includes mandatory supervised fire drills, policies for evacuation and fire training education.

□ 1430

The Secretary of Education will highlight institutions with exemplary fire prevention procedures. As these provisions are implemented, I hope campuses and students alike will take needed precautions and prevent fires in the future.

Madam Speaker, once again, I express my support for National Campus Fire Safety Month and thank Representative PASCRELL for bringing this resolution forward. I ask my colleagues to support this measure.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H. Res. 167, a measure to express the sense of the House of Representatives in support of the goals and ideals of Campus Fire Safety Month. I would like to thank my colleagues, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), for working together to introduce this important resolution.

As we continue to see the effects of the California wildfires on the news, we are reminded that fires can strike anywhere, at anytime, and that includes on a college campus. September has been designated as Campus Fire Safety Month in an effort to remind college campuses and their communities about the dangers of fires on campus. This month reminds campuses that they need to check their fire sprinkler systems, their fire alarm and notification systems, and train students and staff in what to do in case of a fire on campus.

There have been a number of fire tragedies, some fatal, on college campuses in the past. It is for that reason that Congress regularly recognizes Campus Fire Safety Month. We also included a provision in the Higher Education Opportunity Act to ask colleges and universities to report annually on fire safety efforts. The report would include information such as a list of all

student housing facilities and whether or not each is equipped with a sprinkler system or other fire safety system, statistics on occurrences of fires and the injuries that occurred as a result of the fires, information on various fire safety rules and regulations, and information about training provided to students, faculty, and staff.

Our Nation's college students should be able to live on campus with the confidence that they will be safe in their dorms, apartments, or other housing. This measure will take a key step toward ensuring greater awareness of this issue.

I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. PASCRELL. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado and the ranking member. I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 167, which recognizes the goals and ideals of the Campus Fire Safety Month. We just marked the start of a new school year for many college students across this great Nation. This is an opportunity to teach students about the dangers that fires pose both on and off the campus and the steps that students can take in order to remain safe and secure.

This year, over 27 States and the United States Senate have recognized the importance of Campus Fire Safety Month. I am proud that the House will soon join them in bringing awareness to this critical issue.

Madam Speaker, I first became deeply involved in the issue of campus safety after experiencing the aftermath of a catastrophic fire at Seton Hall University in South Orange, New Jersey, in 2000. That dorm fire killed three young freshmen—Aaron Karol, Frank Caltabillota, and John Giunta—and it could have been avoided. It injured 58 other students. One of those students came from my city of Paterson, New Jersey, Dana Christmas McCain. She was a survivor, but the reason she got burned so severely, she was helping others escape the fire.

Since that tragedy, we have seen thousands of fires rage through campuses and off campuses in our colleges and universities, killing 135 students since January 2000. Many of these deaths could have been prevented through effective fire prevention education and awareness, improved building and fire codes and legislation at the local, State, and Federal levels. A key to this is engaging today's college students, making them aware of their personal responsibility for fire safety and the role they play in protecting themselves, friends, and roommates. To reinforce this message, the theme for this safety month is "Fire Safety—It's Part of Living."

We are making progress. We passed the Campus Fire Safety Right-to-Know

Act. I introduced that with Congressman JOE WILSON. It was signed into law last year. Its provisions will soon go into effect nationwide. And I can remember and Mr. WILSON can remember how some colleges and universities fought us on this. Parents have a right to know what is going on on that campus when their children apply to that college, whether they take it seriously or they don't take it seriously. We need to require colleges and universities to provide those same students and parents with the report of the school's campus fire safety policies and records, providing a powerful incentive for them to voluntarily upgrade their safety systems and save lives.

Educating students about fire safety during their time in school will have a strong impact on the choices they make in the future. That is why I am working on new legislation that will provide schools with the resources to develop and deliver new and innovative campus fire safety education programs to their students.

On September 17, 2009, the launch of the fifth annual National Campus Fire Safety Month was held here on Capitol Hill. My brother, Mr. WILSON, was there. At that event, I met with and spoke to a contingent of people from across the Nation, including 20 students from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, parents who have lost children in campus-related fires, fire officials, and advocates who came together for this launch to discuss the important issues of campus fire safety and the legislation currently moving through the Congress. They were led by four national leaders in campus fire safety, including Campus Fire Watch, the Congressional Fire Services Institute, Ohio Fire Safety Coalition, and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

I want to commend everyone who came to Capitol Hill and the thousands more around the country who work tirelessly each day to educate our students, our sons and daughters, their families, faculty, and staff about the danger of fires on our college campuses. Far too many families have had to suffer the unbearable horror of losing a loved one right at the beginning of a promising life.

I will continue to work hard every day to make our colleges safer, secure places for future generations to learn and to grow.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON).

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. I thank you for your leadership, Mr. PETRI. I am very honored to be here.

And, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the hard work of my long-time friend, Congressman BILL PASCRELL of New Jersey. His efforts will save lives. I am also particularly grateful to be here because I know of his hard work, of a lifetime of service. I know of his persistence since youth. He and my oldest

son's father-in-law, Dennis Miskewicz, of Fairfield, New Jersey, were bag boys together at an A&P food store, so I already know what a hardworking person BILL PASCRELL is. And truly, he is making a difference.

I know those of us in South Carolina particularly appreciate his efforts because our State still mourns the loss of students from the University of South Carolina and Clemson at the very tragic fire at Ocean Isle, North Carolina. And as we are discussing the issue of fire safety on campus, we also should emphasize fire safety at vacation homes, rental homes, second homes, the importance of acquiring battery-operated fire detectors, fire alarms. That can make a difference, whether they are homes in the beaches or mountains.

I rise today in support of this resolution to bring needed attention to campus fire safety. I am honored to join again with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) in supporting H. Res. 167, a resolution which supports the goals and ideals of Campus Fire Safety Month.

Last year, 33 States issued proclamations declaring September as Campus Fire Safety Month because it gives our communities an opportunity to raise national awareness of campus fire safety. We have an obligation to ensure students all across the country understand the danger posed by fires both on and off campus and what they can do to stay safe. The resolution supports the goals and ideals of Campus Fire Safety Month by encouraging administrators and municipalities across the country to provide educational programs to all students during September and throughout the year. It encourages our colleges and universities to evaluate the level of fire safety on and off campus at their institutions and to take the necessary steps to create a safe learning environment.

We want to encourage the use of fire suppression and detection systems and help our universities and colleges develop and enforce proper safety measures.

As I am sure all of my colleagues would agree, a child's safety is every parent's number one concern. Having sent four children to college, I know firsthand the pride we have in their achievements. We want the best for our children and we want to know they are safe. No family should have to face the tragedy of losing a daughter or son to a fire, and we should do all we can to provide families, students, teachers, and school administrators with every tool available to keep children safe.

I appreciate the opportunity to work with my colleagues on this issue. I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I think the case has been made in eloquent and bipartisan fashion with regard to the importance of raising awareness and

improving practices to protect American children attending colleges and universities across this country from the risks of fires. I encourage support of the resolution.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 167.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTION OF COUNTRY MUSIC TO AMERICAN LIFE AND CULTURE

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 650) recognizing that country music has made a tremendous contribution to American life and culture and declaring country music to be a uniquely American art form.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 650

Whereas country music was created in the United States and its distinctive sound makes it a uniquely American institution;

Whereas country music is rooted in the folk traditions of the British Isles;

Whereas in the United States, those roots became entangled with the ethnic music of immigrants from other regions and African slaves to create a uniquely American sound;

Whereas in 1922, a country music performance was broadcast on the radio for the first time, and the earliest commercial recording of country music was made, featuring the song "Sallie Gooden", performed by fiddlist A.C. "Eck" Robertson;

Whereas throughout the 1920s, the earliest country music records and radio programs brought the music out of the rural heartland and into homes across the United States;

Whereas no institution is more closely associated with country music than WSM Radio's Grand Ole Opry in Nashville, Tennessee, which, since 1925, has introduced the United States to many of the great talents of country music through live Saturday night performances;

Whereas two of the top selling solo artists of all time, Elvis Presley and Garth Brooks, are rooted in country music;

Whereas Garth Brooks, with 128,000,000 records sold, is the top selling solo artist in United States history;

Whereas top country musician Willie Nelson said that country music is where "people tell their life stories"; and

Whereas country music continues to increase in popularity in the United States and around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) declares country music to be a uniquely American art form; and

(2) recognizes that country music should be honored for its contributions to American life and culture.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 650 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the tremendous influence that country music has made on American culture.

The themes invoked in country music resonate with important American values such as responsibility, determination, and hard work. Some country songs foster an appreciation of the important sacrifices made by our men and women serving in our Armed Forces. "Only in America," by Brooks and Dunn, and "Where the Stars and Stripes and the Eagle Fly," by Aaron Tippin, encourage patriotism and the pursuit of the American Dream. Other songs, like Dolly Parton's "Nine to Five" and Loretta Lynn's "The Pill," echo the struggles of rural and working class women and have become anthems of the women's equality movement.

In addition to powerful patriotic lyrics, the country music industry has also directly supported the causes of our Armed Forces. Portions of the proceeds from some patriotic compilations have even gone to support the United Service Organizations' active duty troops and families of fallen soldiers.

Country music is rooted in the folk traditions of the British Isles. In the New World, those roots meshed with immigrant and African influences. Many gospel, rock & roll, blues, and pop music derives from elements originally heard in country music. Famous artists such as Elvis Presley, Ray Charles, and Garth Brooks were influenced by the sounds and instruments of this music.

Every stage of country's long history has left an imprint on the music. Today, country is many sounds and many styles, some as old as the fiddle and bow, others as new as tomorrow's technology. But we will continue to hear about people's unique experiences through what we call country music.

□ 1445

Madam Speaker, once again I express my support for this resolution, and thank Representative STEARNS for bringing this bill forward. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise today in support of House Resolution 650, recognizing that country

music has made a tremendous contribution to American life and culture and declaring country music to be a uniquely American art form.

The creation of country music can be isolated to the United States. Its origins are rooted in the multitude of ethnicities found in the people of our country. The traditional music of the British Isles mingled with the music of African slaves and several other immigrant groups to create the unique sound that is country music. The new music first became popular nationally in the 1920s and was then called "hill-billy music." The first country song was broadcast on the radio in 1922.

Since that time, numerous subgenres have developed within country music. Bluegrass, honky-tonk, country pop, and gospel are just four examples of genres that have developed within country music. Today more than 10 subgenres of country music exist.

Since country music first became popular in the 1920s, it has continued to increase in popularity. In the 1930s and 1940s, it made its debut in Hollywood movies and became even more popular. In the 1950s and 1960s, Elvis Presley and Johnny Cash topped the charts with their own brands of the music. The 1970s and 1980s saw Willie Nelson and Dolly Parton become music icons for their roles in the popularization of country music. Today, country music has its own television channel, a multitude of radio stations dedicated to it in every section of the country, and its own system of awards.

The popularity of country music has spread beyond the United States in recent years. Canada and Australia have grown increasingly fond of the music. But country music will always be recognized as a uniquely American art form. I ask my colleagues to support this resolution.

I yield such time as he may consume to my colleague from Florida, CLIFF STEARNS.

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. I thank my colleague, and I thank my Democrat colleague for recognizing this important bill, H. Res. 650. The history of this country and the history of country-western music sort of work together. The motto of the United States is "E Pluribus Unum," meaning out of many, one. It depicts the history and origin of this great country. Now, my colleagues, the history of country music resembles very similar characteristics, with the many styles that are prevalent today. As mentioned earlier, country music can trace its roots all the way back to the folk tradition of the British Isles and the Celts of Central and Western Europe.

However, here in the United States, early immigrants as well as African slaves contributed to a new distinct style that continued to develop through the 18th and 19th centuries. And as mentioned, in 1922, the first

country music performance was broadcast on the radio, and it was a song entitled "Sallie Gooden" performed by fiddler, A.C. Robertson. It was clear at that point that America had created a brand new sound, and it started to take off.

And we know that the influence of American country music is pervasive. Its popularity has extended beyond just the southern part of the United States or the Appalachian Mountains to everywhere in America, all over the world, in fact, with large fan bases in Canada and Australia. And there's many substyles of country-western music, like bluegrass, folk and gospel. They've all combined to provide a unique instrumentation of country-western music with powerful vocals to create one of a kind sounds.

As mentioned, Elvis Presley was one of these. Also Garth Brooks. I think most households will recognize those two names. Elvis Presley has all his faithful fans. In fact, he's imitated in Las Vegas all the time, and he has a charitable foundation that works to provide education and care for those in need. And of course, Garth Brooks, with over 128 million records sold, remains the top-selling solo artist in United States history. The live performances of Garth Brooks set the standard for musicians of all styles in all the world. He continues to use the power of his music to help others, in fact, performing a 2008 charity concert to raise money for victims of the California wildfires.

So having knowledge of history makes us more appreciative of what we have today in country-western music. Willie Nelson states that country music is where you tell your life stories. The history of country music is a great story; it's an American story. I should know. I had the opportunity to manage a Quality Inn, a 156-room hotel, and we had a restaurant, and we had a great country-western bar which I named the Ocala Corral. We taught the two-step dance, and I would bring in bands every 2 weeks—and, perhaps if it was a hot band, it would be six weeks—from Memphis, Tennessee.

And I'd bring these talented bands down to Ocala, Florida. We'd teach the two-step. The number of people that'd come in for a special band, when I hit the right country-western music talent correctly, would just storm the hotel. These bands would provide wonderful entertainment and provided a popular spot for country-western music in Ocala, Florida, which is the heart of Florida, really.

So my colleagues, I rise today in honor of country-western music, its heritage, and hope you all join me and celebrate the impact it's had on our American life.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentleman from Wisconsin has any additional speakers.

Mr. PETRI. I do.

Mr. POLIS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to our colleague from Nashville, Tennessee, MARSHA BLACKBURN.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues today in joyfully rising in strong support of House Resolution 650. The cultural and financial impact of country music on Nashville and indeed our State and our Nation cannot be overstated. From the daily recording sessions on Music Row to the annual CMA Music Festival in June, and the annual awards show that takes place this month, country music is the lifeblood of Nashville and the reason we are affectionately known as Music City USA.

The music industry creates employment opportunities in many industries, including musicians, songwriters, agents, managers, audio engineers, public relations and promotion firms, financial services, security, stage promotion, stage production, transportation operators, and business services. And Madam Speaker, most of these are small businesses, and they are fueled, not only by the love of the music, but also by that entrepreneurial spirit that draws so many people into the music industry.

This vital industry maintains tens of thousands of jobs. And it is responsible for generating hundreds of millions of dollars in revenue and in economic impact for our local economy. The entertainment product created is enjoyed not only coast-to-coast but also around the globe, and it plays a significant role in our Nation's trade products, certainly bringing joy to hundreds of millions of people around the world each and every day, many of those choosing to come to America and choosing to come to the home of country music to visit and experience this uniquely American art form.

So it is with great pride that I, along with my colleagues and on behalf of my constituents in Tennessee's Seventh Congressional District, rise today to take a moment to recognize the tremendous impact of country music, our unique American art form, and to join in asking my colleagues to join with us in this celebration.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentleman from Wisconsin has any additional speakers.

Mr. PETRI. I have no additional speakers, and yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield back.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 650.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SUPPORTING READ FOR THE RECORD DAY

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 741) expressing support for designation of October 8, 2009, as national Jumpstart's "Read for the Record Day," as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 741

Whereas Jumpstart, a national early education organization, is working to ensure that all children in the United States enter school prepared to succeed;

Whereas year-round, Jumpstart recruits and trains college students and community volunteers to work with preschool children in low-income communities, helping them to develop the language, literacy, and social skills they need to succeed in school and in life;

Whereas since 1993, Jumpstart has engaged nearly 21,000 adults to serve almost 80,000 young children in communities across the Nation;

Whereas Jumpstart's Read for the Record, presented in partnership with the Pearson Foundation, is an annual campaign, now in its fourth year, that brings national attention to the crisis in early education by organizing the world's largest shared reading experience;

Whereas the goals of the campaign are to raise national awareness about the importance of early education by engaging 1,000,000 children reading the same book on the same day, provide books to children in low-income households through donations and book purchases and sponsorship, and prepare students for school success;

Whereas Jumpstart hopes to engage more than 1,000,000 children to read "The Very Hungry Caterpillar" in this record-breaking celebration of reading, service, and fun, all in support of the Nation's preschoolers; and

Whereas October 8, 2009, would be an appropriate date to designate as national Jumpstart's "Read for the Record Day" because it is the date Jumpstart aims to set a new world record for the world's largest shared reading experience on the same day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the designation of "Read for the Record Day";

(2) commends Jumpstart's Read for the Record in its fourth year; and

(3) encourages adults, including grandparents, parents, teachers, and college students to come together with children of all ages to create the world's largest shared reading experience to show their support for early literacy and Jumpstart's year-long program working with preschool children in low-income communities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have 5 legislative days during which Members may revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 741 into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 741, which supports the designation of October 8, 2009, as national Jumpstart's "Read For the Record Day."

I would like to yield 5 minutes to the sponsor of the bill, my colleague from the great State of Colorado, BETSY MARKEY.

Ms. MARKEY of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of one very hungry caterpillar and the thousands of children eager to hear his story. This Thursday, October 8, marks Read for the Record Day, a day in which we're striving to break the world record for the largest shared reading day ever. On Thursday, adults and children all around the world will gather to read Eric Carle's classic book, "The Very Hungry Caterpillar," in celebration of reading and service to preschool children.

In my own house, it was "The Polar Express" that captivated my children's imaginations and hearts at an early age. We would all snuggle up on the couch and enter the world of ringing bells, late-night train rides and the North Pole. Though the days when my three children could fit on my lap have long since passed, the tradition of reading continues. When a child is exposed to books at an early age, it can instill a love of reading and helps to build the foundation for success at school.

Jumpstart is a nonprofit dedicated to such success through early childhood education. College students and community volunteers tutor and mentor preschool children, empowering them with the tools necessary to be successful when they reach kindergarten. Since its inception, Jumpstart has worked with over 70,000 preschoolers.

Now in its fourth year, Jumpstart's Read for the Record Day highlights the importance of early involvement of adults in the lives of at-risk preschoolers. Most children in low-income communities have few, if any, age-appropriate books in their homes. Without the necessary tools and instructions, one in three schoolchildren arrives at the first day of school unprepared to learn, primarily due to economic instability. Jumpstart's Read for the Record campaign raises awareness about the importance of early literacy by encouraging adults to serve and read with young children. Through the campaign, thousands of books are distributed to young children in low-income communities, and Jumpstart's year-round program is supported.

My resolution, House Resolution 741, designates October 8, 2009, as Read for the Record Day and encourages people of all ages to join us in reading for this record this Thursday. I urge support of this resolution.

□ 1500

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of the resolution before us, House Resolution 741, expressing support for the designation of this Thursday, October 8, 2009, as "Read for the Record Day."

Jumpstart is a national early education organization that recruits and trains college students and community volunteers to work with preschool children in low-income communities. These volunteers help young children to develop language, literacy and social skills. Since 1993, Jumpstart has engaged nearly 21,000 adults to serve almost 80,000 young children.

On Thursday, October 8, Jumpstart is working with its partners, including the Pearson Foundation, Walmart Stores, Inc., American Eagle Outfitters, Sodexo, Penguin Young Readers Group, Chase, and the American Association of Retired Persons, to continue its annual campaign to attempt to organize the world's largest shared reading experience.

In 2006, the international campaign was created to bring preschool children together with valued grownups to read the same book, on the same day, in communities all over the world. In 2008, a world record was set as nearly 700,000 readers shared the classic children's tale, *Corduroy*.

The goals of the campaign are to raise national awareness about the importance of early education. Jumpstart is working to provide books to children in low-income households through donations, book purchases and sponsorship in order to prepare more children for school success.

On "Read for the Record Day" in 2009, the hope is to engage more than 1 million children to read *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* and set a new world record for the world's largest shared reading experience on the same day. Thursday, October 8, can be a celebration of reading, service, and fun in support of the Nation's preschoolers.

I stand in support of designating October 8 as "Read for the Record Day" in order to encourage grandparents, parents, teachers, and students to come together with children of all ages to create the world's largest shared reading experience to show their support for early literacy.

I ask my colleagues' support, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Research shows that the number of books in a home is the single strongest indicator of a child's future reading ability—setting him or her on a track record for success in school and in life. Unfortunately, many low-income chil-

dren lack age-appropriate books in their homes. With this campaign, Jumpstart gives each participating Jumpstart child a copy of *The Very Hungry Caterpillar* for their home library. Jumpstart and its partners have asked libraries and schools to host a reading event so that all children can participate on October 8, even if the kids don't have a copy of the official book at home.

In addition to this campaign, numerous other programs work to enhance early childhood literacy. Jumpstart has sponsored Read Across America Day—which encourages parents to read to their children. Jumpstart also sponsors the Toys for Tots literacy program that promotes children's literacy while fighting poverty.

Recognizing Read for the Record Day encourages children, students, parents, and teachers to show their support for a shared reading experience. By planning a book drive, reading to children, or volunteering with Jumpstart, we can all play a significant role in helping to educate the youth of this country.

With that, I want to thank Representative MARKEY for introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise before you today in support of H. Res. 741, "Expressing support for designation of October 8, 2009, as national Jumpstart's 'Read for the Record Day.'" I would like thank my colleague, Representative MARKEY, for introducing this resolution, as well as the co-sponsors.

As the resolution states, Jumpstart is a national early education organization, which is working to ensure that all children in the United States enter school prepared to succeed. Year-round, Jumpstart recruits and trains college students and community volunteers to work with preschool children in low-income communities, helping them to develop the language, literacy, and social skills they need to succeed in school and in life.

Since 1993, Jumpstart has engaged nearly 21,000 adults to serve almost 80,000 young children in communities across the Nation. Jumpstart's Read for the Record, presented in partnership with the Pearson Foundation, is an annual campaign, now in its fourth year, that brings national attention to the crisis in early education by organizing the world's largest shared reading experience.

The goals of the campaign are to raise national awareness about the importance of early education by engaging one million children reading the same book on the same day, provide books to children in low-income households through donations and book purchases and sponsorship, and raise money to help bring Jumpstart to more children to prepare them for school success. Jumpstart hopes to engage more than one million children to read "The Very Hungry Caterpillar" in this record-breaking celebration of reading, service, and fun, all in support of the Nation's preschoolers.

I join this body in supporting the designation of "Read for the Record Day," and agree that October 8, 2009, is the date Jumpstart aims to set a new world record for the world's largest

shared reading experience, and, as such, is a perfect date for this designation.

I also join this body in commending Jumpstart's Read for the Record in its fourth year; and encouraging adults, including grandparents, parents, teachers, and college students to come together with children of all ages to create the world's largest shared reading experience to show their support for early literacy and Jumpstart's year-long program working with preschool children in low-income communities.

Mr. POLIS. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 741, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING DYKE MARSH WILDLIFE PRESERVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 701) to recognize the Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve as a unique and precious ecosystem.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 701

Whereas the Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve on the west bank of the Potomac River just south of Alexandria in Fairfax County is one of the largest remaining freshwater tidal marshes in the Greater Washington, DC, area;

Whereas Congress expressly designated the Dyke Marsh ecosystem for protection in 1959, fifty years ago, under Public Law 86-41 "so that fish and wildlife development and their preservation as wetland wildlife habitat shall be paramount";

Whereas the Honorable John D. Dingell of Michigan, the late Honorable John P. Saylor of Pennsylvania, and the late Honorable Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin were instrumental in passing this legislation and in preventing proposed development along the Potomac River, thereby protecting the Dyke Marsh ecosystem from further dredging, filling, and other activities incompatible with a preserve;

Whereas Dyke Marsh is 5,000 to 7,000 years old and is a unique natural treasure in the national capital region, with more than 6,500 species of plants, insects, fish, birds, reptiles and amphibians contained within an approximately 485-acre parcel;

Whereas the Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve is a significant element in the historic character of the Mount Vernon Memorial Parkway;

Whereas freshwater tidal marshes are rare, and the Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve is one of the few climax, tidal, riverine, narrow-leaved cattail wetlands in the United States National Park Service system;

Whereas wetlands provide ecological services such as flood control, attenuation of tidal energy, water quality enhancement, wildlife habitat, nursery and spawning grounds, and recreational and aesthetic enjoyment;

Whereas the Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve serves as an outdoor laboratory for scientists, educators, students, naturalists, artists, photographers, and others, attracting people of all ages; and

Whereas the Friends of Dyke Marsh is a conservation advocacy group created in 1975 and dedicated to the preservation and restoration of this wetland habitat and its natural resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve of Fairfax County, Virginia, as a unique and precious ecosystem that serves as an invaluable natural resource both locally and nationally;

(2) recognizes and expresses appreciation for Representative John Dingell's, Representative John Saylor's, and Representative Henry Reuss's leadership in preserving this precious natural resource;

(3) celebrates the 50th anniversary of the Federal legislation designating the Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve as a protected wetland habitat;

(4) expresses the need to continue to conserve, protect and restore this fragile habitat, in which a diverse array of plants, animals and other natural resources is threatened by past dredging and filling, a gradual depletion in size, urban and suburban development, river traffic, stormwater runoff, poaching, and non-native invasive species; and

(5) commends the Friends of Dyke Marsh for its longstanding commitment to promoting conservation and environmental awareness and stewardship, so that the Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve may be enjoyed by generations for the next 50 years and into the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentlemen from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve, one of the largest remaining freshwater tidal marshes in the greater Washington, D.C. area. Established in 1959 under the leadership of Representatives DINGELL, Saylor, and Reuss, this preserve provides habitat for more than 6,500 species of plants and animals along the Potomac River.

Freshwater tidal marshes are rare ecosystems providing ecological services and serving as an outdoor laboratory for scientists, educators, students, artists, birdwatchers, and many others to enjoy this unique and valuable environment.

I commend Congressman JIM MORAN of Virginia for introducing this resolution, and I urge its passage.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 701 that has been offered by my colleague from Virginia (Mr. MORAN). Fifty years ago, Congress designated Dyke Marsh, a section of the Potomac River shore in northern Virginia, as a wildlife preserve. It is appropriate that we take time today to recognize the 50th anniversary of that act because the marsh provides not only a great recreational setting for joggers, bike riders and birders, but also a place where people from a largely urban background can experience close up this example of the dynamic and resilient natural shoreline marshes provide.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. I thank my friend and colleague very much.

Madam Speaker, this resolution recognizes Dyke Marsh. It has been around for 5,000 to 7,000 years. It is a unique freshwater tidal marsh. But it also recognizes someone who may not have been around for 5,000 years, but has been around for 50 years, and that is our very distinguished colleague, JOHN DINGELL, who introduced the resolution 50 years ago to preserve Dyke Marsh as a habitat for wildlife and fish and the ecosystem in the Washington metropolitan area.

I want to note that my colleague in the United States Senate, Senator JIM WEBB, last week introduced a companion piece, Senate Resolution 297, which also recognizes this significant milestone.

In 1959, this body passed legislation that designated Fairfax County's Dyke Marsh as a protected ecosystem for the purpose of promoting fish and wildlife development and preserving their natural habitat. Now, at the time, Dyke Marsh was being dredged for commercial purposes. They were going deeper and deeper to get gravel. They were ruining the ecosystem.

For those who live in the Washington metropolitan area or may be visiting the Washington metropolitan area, if you go down the George Washington Parkway toward Mount Vernon, right after the city of Alexandria, you will see Dyke Marsh. Belle Haven Marina is there.

Dyke Marsh is about 500 acres. It's preserved. It's a beautiful area. You can see bald eagles; you can see great blue herons. You can see snapping turtles; a whole lot of bullfrogs. There aren't a lot of places left in the Washington area where you can see this unless you go to the zoo.

But these creatures—the fish, the wildlife, and even the plants, some of which are rare, are in their natural habitat because of Chairman DINGELL's efforts. He got together with John Saylor from Pennsylvania—my friend

Mr. SHUSTER knows him, as did Mr. SHUSTER's father—and the late Chairman Henry Reuss of Wisconsin. The three of them got together and they got this legislation through that stopped the dredging of Dyke Marsh, and it has been preserved to this day. Whether we can expand it and even restore it more to its natural habitat, I don't know. But I know because of this legislation we're at least going to be able to preserve what we have.

As the gentlelady suggested, it has over 6,500 species of plants and animals, some of which are threatened or endangered. It enhances water quality, stems shoreline erosion, and creates an aesthetic and recreational escape for people of all ages.

I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing the significance of Dyke Marsh, in reaffirming our commitment generally to protecting our Nation's ecosystems, and in honoring three giants of the Congress—JOHN DINGELL, John Saylor, and Henry Reuss—whose leadership and commitment to environmental stewardship were instrumental in the Dyke Marsh's preservation.

I also want to recognize Ann Toohey, who has done the research and staff support on this. I want to express appreciation to my colleague, Congressman GERRY CONNOLLY, whose district is just to the south of Dyke Marsh, but who was the Chair of the Fairfax County Board when Fairfax County made the especially important efforts to preserve Dyke Marsh.

Again, I urge passage of this bill.

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise to salute my colleagues Congressman JOHN DINGELL and Congressman JIM MORAN for their support of a rare natural and national treasure in Northern Virginia, the Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve.

In 1959 Congress passed legislation to make this wetland ecosystem a National Park unit, which was introduced by Congressmen DINGELL, John Saylor and Henry Reuss. Congressman MORAN has introduced H. Res. 701, of which I am a proud cosponsor, to recognize their efforts and the 50th anniversary of Dyke Marsh.

The Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve, just south of Alexandria on the Virginia shoreline of the Potomac River, is a rare, 485-acre freshwater, tidal wetland in suburban northern Virginia, just north and east of my district. I was proud to represent this Wildlife Preserve during my tenure as Chairman of the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors. The marsh is 5,000 to 7,000 years old and is one of the most significant temperate, tidal, freshwater, riverine marshes in the National Park system. It is a remnant of the tidal wetlands that once lined the Potomac River.

Congress designated Dyke Marsh as a nature preserve “so that fish and wildlife development and their preservation as wetland wildlife habitat shall be paramount.” Today it has 360 known species of plants, 6,000 arthropods, 38 fish, 16 reptiles, 14 amphibians and over 300 birds.

“Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve is a wonderfully complex ecosystem,” says Georgetown Biology Professor Dr. Edd Barrows. “It may

have as many as 18,000 species, from bacteria through bald eagles.” Depending on the time and season, visitors can see bullfrogs, snapping turtles, great blue herons, black rat snakes, wood ducks, red-winged blackbirds and plants like pickerelweed, spatter-pond lily and wild rice. It is an important outdoor classroom for students of all ages and a laboratory for many area scientists.

Like all wetlands, Dyke Marsh provides ecological services including flood control, water quality enhancement, habitat, fish nursery, and shoreline stabilization.

I commend Congressman DINGELL for his vision, and Congressman MORAN for his commitment to preserving this ecological gem. I have been and will continue to be a proud supporter of the Dyke Marsh Wildlife Preserve.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I, again, urge Members to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 701.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL ESTUARIES DAY

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 710) supporting the goals and ideals of “National Estuaries Day”.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 710

Whereas the estuary regions of the United States comprise a significant share of the national economy, with 43 percent of the population, 40 percent of employment, and 49 percent of economic output located in such regions;

Whereas coasts and estuaries contribute more than \$800,000,000,000 annually in trade and commerce to the Nation's economy;

Whereas more than 43 percent of all adults in the United States visit a sea coast or estuary at least once a year to participate in some form of recreation, generating \$8,000,000,000 to \$12,000,000,000 in revenue annually;

Whereas more than 28,000,000 jobs in the United States are supported through commercial and recreational fishing, boating, tourism, and other coastal industries that rely on healthy estuaries;

Whereas estuaries provide vital habitat for countless species of fish and wildlife, includ-

ing many that are listed as threatened or endangered;

Whereas estuaries provide critical ecosystem services that protect human health and public safety, including water filtration, flood control, shoreline stabilization and erosion prevention, and protection of coastal communities during extreme weather events;

Whereas 55,000,000 acres of estuarine habitat have been destroyed over the last 100 years;

Whereas bays once filled with fish and oysters have become dead zones filled with excess nutrients, chemical wastes, and harmful algae;

Whereas sea level rise is accelerating the degradation of estuaries by submerging low-lying lands, eroding beaches, converting wetlands to open water, exacerbating coastal flooding, and increasing the salinity of estuaries and freshwater aquifers;

Whereas in the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.), Congress found and declared that it is national policy to preserve, protect, develop, and where possible, to restore or enhance, the resources of the Nation's coastal zone, including estuaries, for current and future generations;

Whereas estuary restoration efforts cost-effectively restore natural infrastructure in local communities, helping to create jobs and reestablish the natural functions of estuaries that yield countless benefits;

Whereas 62.3 percent of habitat restoration funds of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Public Law 111-5) were awarded to projects in estuaries, and 90 percent of the total NOAA habitat restoration funding under such Act will benefit estuaries; and

Whereas September 26, 2009, has been designated “National Estuaries Day” to increase awareness among all citizens, including local, State, and Federal officials, about the importance of healthy estuaries and the need to protect them: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of “National Estuaries Day”;

(2) acknowledges the importance of estuaries to the Nation's economic well-being and productivity;

(3) recognizes the persistent threats that undermine the health of the Nation's estuaries;

(4) applauds the work of national and community organizations and public partners to promote public awareness, protection, and restoration of estuaries; and

(5) reaffirms its support for estuaries, including the preservation, protection, and restoration thereof, and expresses its intent to continue working to protect and restore the estuaries of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

□ 1515

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, National Estuaries Day was established in 1988 and is an annual celebration highlighting the need to protect our Nation's estuaries. Estuaries provide vital habitat for countless fish and wildlife species and contribute significantly to our economy through commerce and recreation. National Estuaries Day was celebrated on September 26 with numerous activities nationwide, from canoe trips in Washington to photography contests in Florida.

This annual public awareness campaign informs our citizens about their connection to these critical places and why these ecosystems need to be preserved, protected, and restored. I commend Congresswoman CASTOR from Florida for introducing this resolution, and I urge its passage.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

The gentlelady from Guam has sufficiently explained the resolution, supporting the goals of National Estuaries Day. As we all know, estuaries are an important component to many species of birds, fish, and mammals. They rely on the estuaries for food, spawning, and other lifecycle needs. Estuaries also provide many people with recreational opportunities, from birdwatching to fishing and many boating activities. Finally, estuaries provide us with critical flood control, protecting coastal communities during severe storms. I support the resolution and urge my colleagues to pass it.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my support for H. Res. 710, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Estuaries Day.

I want to thank my colleague KATHY CASTOR for introducing this resolution, which I have co-sponsored. We both represent coastal districts that are home to amazing estuarine systems that are of great importance to our communities and constituents.

In my district, the Morro Bay National Estuary is an ecological treasure.

Lagoons and wetlands that were once common along the southern California coast are now nearly all filled and developed. But we are fortunate that the Morro Bay Estuary has largely survived. And we must continue to protect this natural resource.

The Estuary provides vital habitat for birds and fish. It is an important stop-over for over 150 species of migratory birds during their annual migration. And it is a critical winter home to several other bird species. The estuary also acts as a nursery for more than 75 percent of commercial fish species in the area.

Since the Morro Bay Estuary was incorporated into the National Program in 1995, the inspiring team of staff and volunteers has spearheaded numerous efforts to preserve and restore the estuary.

For example, partnering with local ranchers, the Estuary Program has installed riparian fencing along nearly 75,000 feet of creek to limit cattle access. This has protected water quality and improved riparian habitat on seven creeks.

The program has provided funding to the City of Morro Bay to remove derelict vessels before they pollute local waters and damage habitat.

They have also established the Estuary Nature Center and WaterFest, to educate the general public about the beauty of the estuary and its importance to water quality and conservation.

In addition, more than 75 dedicated volunteers collect and provide important water quality data for the Estuary Program each year. These data are critical to evaluating the health of the estuary and watershed, as well as compiling a plan to address problems.

Estuaries are among the richest habitats known on earth—providing immeasurable economic and ecological benefits. But they are threatened by pollution and other human activities. We must change our course and work harder to protect them.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote in support of H. Res. 710—to recognize National Estuaries Day and the community organizations that fight to preserve these invaluable resources.

Mr. SHUSTER. Having no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, having no further speakers, again, I urge Members to support this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 710.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING EFFORTS TO CREATE A FLIGHT 93 MEMORIAL

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 795) honoring the people of Shanksville, Pennsylvania, and the Flight 93 Ambassadors for their efforts in creating the Flight 93 temporary memorial and encouraging the completion of the National Park Service Flight 93 National Memorial by the 10th anniversary of September 11, 2001.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 795

Whereas, on September 11, 2001, the passengers and crew of United Flight 93 courageously gave their lives, thereby thwarting a planned attack on our Nation's Capital;

Whereas the Flight 93 crash site is a profound national symbol of American patriotism and spontaneous leadership of citizen heroes;

Whereas the people of Shanksville, Pennsylvania, came together as a community to protect the sacred ground and construct a temporary memorial where Flight 93 crashed on September 11th;

Whereas the Flight 93 Ambassadors, created by members of the Shanksville community after the tragic events of September 11th, have exhibited selfless dedication and leadership by preserving and recounting the heroic story of the brave intervention of the passengers and crew against the terrorists to the memorial's visitors; and

Whereas in large part due to the efforts of the community and Flight 93 Ambassadors, Congress authorized the creation of a permanent national memorial as part of the National Park System under Public Law 107-226, the Flight 93 National Memorial Act: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) honors the Shanksville, Pennsylvania, community and Flight 93 Ambassadors for—

(A) their foresight, dedication, and leadership in protecting the Flight 93 temporary memorial, the preservation and sharing of the heroic story of the brave intervention of the passengers and crew against terrorists; and

(B) their efforts to establish a permanent national memorial to Flight 93; and

(2) encourages the Secretary of the Interior and the National Park Service to complete the Flight 93 National Memorial, as authorized by the Flight 93 National Memorial Act, by the 10th anniversary of the September 11th attacks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Guam.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the resolution under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Guam?

There was no objection.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 795, introduced last week by my colleague Representative BILL SHUSTER, honors the people of Shanksville, Pennsylvania. Eight years ago, the town of Shanksville entered the history books in a tragic way. But since that dreadful day, the community, working with the Flight 93 ambassadors, has protected the temporary Flight 93 Memorial and pressed to establish a permanent national memorial to that plane's heroic passengers.

House Resolution 795, Madam Speaker, recognizes those valiant efforts and encourages the Secretary of the Interior and the National Park Service to complete the Flight 93 National Memorial by the 10th anniversary of the September 11 attacks.

Madam Speaker, we support this resolution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentlelady from Guam for her support on resolution 795. On the morning of September 11, 2001, United Airlines Flight 93 was hijacked

by al Qaeda terrorists, but their evil plan was heroically derailed when the brave passengers and crew aboard that flight performed the first counter-attack in the war on terror. They fought back. They sacrificed their lives so that others could live.

Madam Speaker, today we have a pretty good idea of what the terrorists intended to use Flight 93 for, an attack on Washington, D.C., and most likely the Capitol Building itself. The fact that the passengers and the crew ultimately crashed Flight 93 in Shanksville saved the lives of hundreds, if not thousands, of tourists, staff and Members of Congress who were in the building on that day. I was in the Capitol Complex that morning, and I know many of my colleagues serving today were here and are grateful for the passengers and crew of Flight 93.

The complete sacrifice made by those brave men and women who did an extraordinary thing in the face of an extraordinary circumstance deserves to be remembered and honored. Since that fateful day 8 years ago, the hallowed ground of the crash site has been visited by thousands of Americans from across the country to pay tribute to the memory of those extraordinary Americans.

Since the attacks, the people of Shanksville and Somerset County have come together to protect the crash site and welcome visitors to their community. Along with the Flight 93 ambassadors, tremendous progress has been made toward establishing a permanent memorial at the crash site, ensuring that their heroic story lives on and inspires current and future generations of Americans.

Eight years have passed since the 9/11 attacks, and we are encouraged by the progress that has been made towards completing the official national memorial to Flight 93. I am proud to sponsor this resolution which calls on the Secretary of the Interior to complete the congressionally authorized memorial in Shanksville by the 10th anniversary of 9/11.

While we will never be able to repay the heroes of that infamous day, it is our hope that with this memorial, their sacrifice will be permanently recorded, and the site of their passing will forever be guarded for all to pay tribute.

I appreciate the opportunity to offer this resolution, and again, I thank my colleagues for their support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Guam.

I rise today in support of House Resolution 795. This legislation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania honors the people of Shanksville, Pennsylvania, and the Flight 93 ambassadors for creating a temporary memorial for the

passengers of United Flight 93 and urges the National Park Service to complete a national memorial.

The men and women onboard Flight 93 prevented a fourth attack on September 11, 2001, against American citizens. Arming themselves with whatever they could find, they prevented the hijackers from mounting a potentially disastrous attack on a target in Washington, D.C. Without their sacrifice, it's very possible that many of us and the building in which we stand would not be here today. It's almost certain that many other innocent civilians would have died.

Of those brave souls onboard Flight 93, 18 of them were from New Jersey, including two from the 12th Congressional District, which I have the privilege to represent. One of those heroes was Todd Beamer, a respected businessman from Cranbury, New Jersey. He was a man of deep religious faith, a loving father, a caring and devoted husband to his wife, Lisa. And it was his famous phrase, "Let's roll," that helped inspire our Nation to meet his high standard of shared sacrifice and to remind Americans in those dark days following September 11 that America would not just survive but America would prevail against hate and extremism.

Lisa and Todd Beamer's children David, Drew and Morgan Kay will grow up knowing their father's act of valor saved the lives of others. He will always be remembered as a hero, along with his fellow passengers.

Richard Guadagno was another amazing passenger on Flight 93. Raised in Trenton, Richard was the manager of the Humboldt Bay National Wildlife Refuge in California, a truly outstanding person. He was on his way back to Eureka, California, after visiting his family in New Jersey and attending his grandmother's 100th birthday party. He too made the ultimate sacrifice.

I have long supported and worked to get funding for a national monument honoring the passengers and crew of Flight 93. People will be able to find inspiration as they look at this memorial and reflect on the essence of America, that Americans are willing to sacrifice much to protect each other even in the face of mortal danger. It will remind us that this is not the last time America will need heroes, that the survival of American ideals depends on ordinary people stepping out of their roles to act in ways that are extraordinary and courageous.

I strongly support this resolution and urge the National Park Service to complete this memorial by the 10th anniversary of that terrible day.

Mr. SHUSTER. Having no further speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding the time and

commend my colleagues from Pennsylvania and New Jersey for this very thoughtful resolution. I would also like to speak to the previous resolution that just passed the House, establishing National Estuaries Day in recognition of these other beautiful and valued places across our country.

Our Nation's estuaries are essential to our economy, jobs, our hobbies and our culture. Estuaries are the vital links between our coastal ecosystems. They are the unique places where rivers and oceans meet, and their irreplaceable wetlands provide unmatched recreational opportunities and millions of jobs in tourism, fishing and other coastal industries.

This is especially true in my hometown of Tampa, Florida, where Tampa Bay provides the lifeblood and character of my community. A significant share of the Tampa Bay area's economy is dependent on our healthy estuary, and the same is true all across the United States, as 28 million jobs are supported through commercial and recreational fishing, boating, tourism, and other coastal industries. Coastal economies and estuaries contribute more than \$800 billion annually in trade and commerce in our great country.

September 26 marked National Estuaries Day, an interagency campaign led by NOAA. Since 1988, NOAA has promoted the importance of estuaries and the need to protect them. So this year was the first time that we introduced a resolution to recognize these important educational and recreational events all across the country. Events occurred in North Carolina, in Florida, in Louisiana, in California. These celebrations ranged from the planting of seed grasses, the protection of marine mammals and other species.

Estuary groups from across the country also met here in the Capitol with representatives from NOAA, the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Environmental Protection Agency.

Madam Speaker, Pat Conroy's new novel, "South of Broad," contains elegant descriptions of estuaries that speak to everyone who values their beauty and riches. Conroy writes: "A freshwater river let mankind drink and be refreshed, but a saltwater river let it return to first things, to moonstruck tides, the rush of spawning fish, the love of language felt in the rhythm of the wasp-waisted swells."

He says: "The tide is a poem that only time could create, and I watched its stream and brim and make its steady dash homeward to the ocean." It is difficult to capture the beauty and value of many of America's national treasures, so we ask the House today to set aside a day to raise awareness and educate others about estuaries, and getting people excited about the natural beauty to be found there.

I thank my colleagues for voting today in support of these goals and ideals.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for this important

resolution, and I thank him for managing the resolutions this afternoon on the floor. Again, I urge my colleagues to support this very important resolution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the H. Res. 795. The legacy of the events of September 11, 2001 still resonates today. We will never forget the harrowing experience of the loss of more than 3,000 lives that marked this national tragedy. We will never forget the events of that day, nor those who paid the ultimate price. We will forever remember how the country suffered profound sadness, the likes of which we as a nation hope to never experience again.

Madam Speaker, I recall vividly the intense emotions evoked as the attacks unfolded. The Nation watched in horror as two airliners crashed into the Twin Towers and brought down the World Trade Center. That horror intensified as we witnessed an attack on the Pentagon—and a crashed airplane in Pennsylvania. Horror turned to anger as it came to light that the attacks were the actions of hate-filled cowards who had no respect for human life. I remember too, that in the aftermath of these senseless attacks, we came together as a nation and with friends from around the world united in grief and sadness. That moment transformed our country and the world, as the resolve of our Nation strengthened and our principles hardened.

We remember the heroes from that day; those who ran into the danger, sacrificing themselves to save strangers. We remember the heroes from United Flight 93 who overpowered the terrorists and gave their own lives to prevent the deaths of countless others. We hope that their families can take some small measure of comfort knowing that Americans have made a permanent place for those heroes in our hearts.

As a Senior Member of the Foreign Affairs and Homeland Security Committees, I believe that we must continue to honor the fallen by working to prevent needless deaths. In the years since September 11, 2001, Congress has worked hard to make sure that such a tragedy will never happen again. In large part, we have taken heed of the advice of the 9/11 Commission and built a strong system to prevent future attacks.

Madam Speaker, I rise before this body to say that our work is not yet done. Our Nation's rail and mass transit lines continue to be vulnerable. Millions of Americans rely on our rail and mass transit for transportation. Terrorist attacks in Madrid in 2004 and London in 2006 indicate that transportation routes continue to be potential security threats. We must not let another tragedy occur.

Preventing terrorism at home begins with addressing terrorism abroad. We must engage nations that are susceptible to the influence of extremists and arm them with the tools to fight radicalism. That means not only providing weapons of war but also increasing education, improving living conditions, and increasing the capacity to govern. The struggle against terrorism will be won in the hearts and minds of people around the world.

Madam Speaker, I urge all members to join me in supporting H. Res. 722. Let us remember this day and the tragedy that befell the Nation by properly honoring the victims with our renewed commitment to America's security.

Ms. BORDALLO. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 795.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1730

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO) at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2647, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2647) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2010 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, to provide special pays and allowances to certain members of the Armed Forces, expand concurrent receipt of military retirement and VA disability benefits to disabled military retirees, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORBES. I have a motion at the desk, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Forbes moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on

the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2647 be instructed to not recede to the Senate on division E of the Senate amendment (regarding the Matthew Shepard Hate Crimes Prevention Act).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. FORBES. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is truly a sad day as we come before the House today to have to even bring this motion to instruct conferees. But essentially what the motion to instruct conferees does is to simply make sure, when we're dealing with something as important as the Defense authorization bill, that we're dealing with the Defense authorization bill—that we're not saddling it with the hate crimes legislation which, sadly, is what we are now doing.

Mr. Speaker, across America, people are becoming more and more disillusioned by the processes that they see taking place here in the House of Representatives and down the hall in the Senate. And this is a perfect example of what that process has come to be, when we take a hate crimes legislation that should stand on its own accord, that has nothing to do with the Defense authorization bill, but we marry them together and saddle them and bring them to the House floor with the take-it-or-leave-it approach.

Mr. Speaker, we need to watch what's happening from this administration and unfortunately from the leadership in both the House and the Senate to destroy any even pretense of transparency anymore in the country.

I watched this year as we saw a sea change where so many of the policies have now led us to a point where our budget is driving defense posture instead of defense posture driving the budget. For the first time in my lifetime that I know of, this administration came down and literally issued a gag order to individuals in the Pentagon where they couldn't even talk to Members of Congress to tell us where they were cutting programs, where they were spending money, and to give us the reports that we needed, or even testify. In fact, the Army had to even cancel a hearing that it had before the Armed Services Committee because of that gag order.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where the law requires the administration to tell us a plan. How are you going to build ships? That just makes sense. Americans should know: How are you going to build ships? What's the plan? The law requires that they do it and certify that the budget meets that plan. They just refuse to do it because the law doesn't apply to them.

And then they came down with an aviation—they were supposed to give us an aviation plan. The law mandates

it. It's in the statute. Again, they have to tell us what are you doing with planes; how many are you building; what's your plan—and certify that that aviation plan is going to be met by that budget. Mr. Speaker, they just refused.

When the House Armed Services Committee came together and every Member unanimously passed a congressional inquiry mandating that the administration give us that information before this conference report came to the House today, that it was supposed to be here on September 15—they just refused to do it. And they look at every soldier across the country and say, The law applies to you, but it must not apply to us.

And then, Mr. Speaker, we come down today to the situation we're in where we just made a motion to go to conference. And as we made the motion, they are literally writing the bill now in legislative services at this very time, and we haven't even had some hearings—the Readiness Subcommittee never even had a hearing.

Mr. Speaker, what this motion to instruct simply does is this: It says you may not give us all of the information the law requires, you may not hold hearings that we need to get the facts straight, but for goodness sake, at least make sure that we do a Defense authorization bill. And if we're going to do hate crimes legislation, let's do it separately. This gives us a clean vote up or down on that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, once again we see shenanigans going on on the floor of the House. And the idea is that we're going to sneak stuff through, and we're going to use the good will and the support of the American public for our warfighters in order to pass some particular specialized agenda that has nothing to do with the warfighters at all.

This is not new this year. There was a big bill we passed—it was called cap-and-tax—3 o'clock in the morning. Three hundred pages of amendments passed. It came here to the floor for us to debate, and we are asking is there a copy of the bill on the floor? And the answer was no, there's not even a copy of the bill on the floor because of the fact we're going to do this in the dark of night with tricky little procedures.

And here we go with a bill that many of us have labored hard for. I have an important amendment on the bill, and yet what's going on? We're going to slip into this bill to fund—my own son, in fact, who's going to Afghanistan in 3 weeks—we're going to use the good will of the voters of America to slip into this thing a bill called hate crimes which has nothing to do whatsoever with what's being passed.

It is more of the same cloak and mirrors, dark of the night, slippery kind of stuff the American public is fed up with, and I am fed up with it. I have three sons that have graduated from the Naval Academy. I have two sons who are in the Marine Corps right now. This bill talks about funding them and funding the defense of our country, which I take very seriously.

But to put into this bill this hate crimes bill which has been, I think, kicked around the Judiciary Committee for years and to try to connect that with something that's unrelated is just procedurally wrong. It's something that is shameful. It should not happen on this floor. And in that regard, I refuse to vote for this bill in spite of the fact that the bill is good underneath.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it's important to note that the hate crimes legislation has passed as a stand-alone bill in the House three times over the last decade, and now it's attached to a Department of Defense authorization bill. And I am happy, Mr. Chairman, to see this bill, which is an important and long overdue step in our continuing efforts to secure for all Americans the full blessings of liberty under our Constitution.

On several occasions, as I said, this bill has passed the House and the Senate. This year, with the support of the President, I am hopeful that we will finally see the bill signed and enacted.

Mr. Speaker, the incidence of hate crimes is continuing at a high rate. I think we've seen the degeneration of the level of political discourse in this country as it has descended into threats of misconduct and violence. I just want to point out a historical fact here because the incidence of hate crimes certainly is continuing at a high rate.

The incidence of brutal violence against individuals based on hateful bias against certain identifiable groups has unfortunately a long and shameful history in this country. For example, nearly 4,000 African Americans were tortured and killed between 1880 and 1930. In our day, since 1991—and I must confess to you, my days go back a little longer than that—but I must tell you that since 1991, there have been more than 118,000 hate crimes documented by the FBI. It has been 7,624 just in 2007. And those are only documented cases.

What this bill does, ladies and gentlemen who are viewing and listening to this message, it enables the Justice Department to come to the aid of State and local law enforcement agencies in investigating and prosecuting this bias-based brutality, and it helps to defer their cost when these kinds of crimes overwhelm State and local resources. And when necessary—and if approved by the highest Senate-con-

firmed department officials—it authorizes the department to step in and prosecute at the Federal level.

The bill expands existing Federal hate crimes law beyond the narrow confines of protecting access to a limited set of specified protected activities, and it adds to the current list of group characteristics deservedly recognized for protection—due to their being well-known targets for bias-based violence—four new ones that also clearly belong on the list: sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, and disability.

These crimes of violence are directed not just against those who are directly attacked—they are targeting the entire group with the threat of violence. No group should have to live under that kind of threat as they seek to go about their everyday duties and lifestyle here in America. Everyone should be protected.

So the groups in the bill differ from one another. They differ from other groups that some have been trying to add on which do not share this same kind of history of being targeted for hate-based violence.

Our approach is consistent with the judgment made by the States that have State hate crimes laws. They've made the same judgment as we have made for Federal law that many groups should be protected elsewhere in the law, not in hate crimes law. An argument is often made that since that is a State offense, the Feds should not get involved with it. But I'll tell you, the sale of drugs, State law violation, also a Federal law violation.

□ 1745

Our Federal criminal code mirrors sometimes the State laws, and other times State laws mirror Federal law when it comes to certain activities that are against the law. And so this is no different. Our approach is consistent with the judgment made by the States that have hate crimes laws, and this bill is definitely consistent with the Constitution.

It applies only to bias-motivated violent crimes. It in no way impinges on constitutionally protected speech, writing or other expression, including expression of religious beliefs, but not limited to that. That would be true in any event. But we state it plainly in the bill.

This bill has widespread support, over 120 cosponsors, and more than 300 civil rights, education, religious and civic organizations, including the NAACP, the ACLU and the Leadership Conference of Civil Rights.

Virtually every major law enforcement organization in this country has endorsed the bill, including the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National District Attorneys Association; and most district attorneys that I know of are certainly not flaming liberals. They believe in the rule of law and they believe in adherence to it. When there is a criminal law violation, they will prosecute to the

full extent of the law. So that is very important. The National District Attorneys Association, the National Sheriffs Association, the Police Executive Research Forum and 31 State attorneys general endorse the bill. That is very impressive.

And it is supported by over 45 leading mainstream religious organizations, who dismiss claims that the bill would somehow interfere with religious speech "unfounded fears."

Enacting the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Protection Act is a critical step towards keeping our communities safe from hate-based violence and ensuring that all Americans can enjoy the blessings of liberty without fear.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia talked about the rule of law. It is the rule of law that we are concerned with today, the rule of law that this administration refuses to obey with regard to sending us the documents and the information the statute requires so that we could make an intelligent decision about this conference report.

He talks about issues. Regardless of where you stand on this legislation, you could talk about transportation, space exploration, health care reform or immigration reform. But they have no place in the Defense authorization bill.

I just want to point out to the Speaker and to those listening to the debate, at 5:36 tonight we made the motion to go into conference. The report is already being written. It is a take-it-or-leave-it report. This is the only shot anyone will have at changing this report.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished ranking member from California, Congressman McKEON.

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. And my good friend from Georgia that just gave a strong message of his support for hate crimes, I respect, and I have a strong feeling against it. But the issue that we are here on the floor talking about should be the defense of our Nation, especially when we are at a time of war.

While the Senate was considering the National Defense Authorization Act, division E was attached to the bill as an amendment. The NDAA is an inappropriate vehicle for this controversial and unconstitutional legislation. Hate crimes proponents are using this important national security bill to get this legislation to the President's desk through the back door.

This has no place on the Defense bill. It's not germane to the work of the committee, couldn't be added on in the House, had to be done in the Senate, and needlessly introduces a partisan matter in an otherwise bipartisan bill. We need a clean conference report that does honor to the men and women in uniform.

There is one thing that we all agree on, and that is that violent crime is deplorable, regardless of its motivation. That is why all violent crimes must be vigorously prosecuted. However, a decision to prosecute should not be based on the status of the victim or the thought process of the perpetrator. Violence is violence and should be dealt with accordingly.

We've had several meetings of the so-called "big four" talking about working on the conference report on this committee. Chairman SKELTON and I were in agreement on this issue. We felt that it should not be added to the conference report. This bill passed in the House. It passed in the Senate. I don't know why they can't bring it to the floor as a freestanding bill and have it pass on its own. Why we need to attach it to a Defense bill is because the Defense bill needs to be passed, and people will vote for it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FORBES. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. McKEON. I think it's a crime to add it to a bill that is so important that we pass every year for our troops, for those men and women in uniform, that we have to muddy up the issue by putting a hate crimes legislation attached onto this bill.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) who is the distinguished chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I agree: it makes no more logical sense to add a hate crimes bill to the Defense bill than it would to take a bill requiring people to be allowed to use their guns in the national parks to a credit card bill. But that's what the Senate did. The Senate added a bill dealing with the rights of gun owners in the national parks to the credit card bill with which there was no logical connection.

Now, I wish the Senate wouldn't do things like that. I wish a lot of things. But when we are confronted with the reality of the Senate, we have to act.

Now, it is conceivable that you would have people who are so devoted to the principle of having no illogical attachment that they would oppose it in every case. I must have been in the Cloakroom when Republicans rose to denounce the Senate for adding the bill allowing the use of guns in parks to the credit card bill. That was done. Not a single Republican, to my recollection, objected. Indeed, quite to the contrary, they all voted for it, which makes it very clear: the objection here is not to the Senate adding an unrelated bill, because the Republicans in this House have voted for that time and time and time again. It is an objection to protecting against hate crimes people who are gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender.

Now, some say we shouldn't have these hate crimes laws. But their in-

consistency is I don't remember them trying to repeal the hate crimes laws that are on the books. There is nothing new about hate crimes here. There is nothing new about its constitutionality. By the way, if you say violence should be violence, how about somebody having the intellectual integrity to get up and repeal that statute that says, if someone assaults someone standing next to me, it might be a misdemeanor, but if somebody assaults me, a Member of Congress, it's a Federal felony. We have a major distinction. We are protected by special laws, older people, people who are religious. Then they say, it's a matter of choice. The level of intelligence involved in thinking that being gay or lesbian is a matter of choice aside, religion is a matter of choice. People convert to religions. Does that mean we shouldn't protect people against hate crimes based on religion?

Finally, we are told this is being sneaked through. One of the earlier speakers, in a total flight from reality, said it is being sneaked through. It passed the House. It was debated. It went through the regular committee process, and it passed the House. Yes, from time to time, the United States Senate, which has no rules preventing it, adds unrelated bills. If there are Members who have consistently opposed that practice, they have the right to oppose it here and say that is the reason.

But Members who have voted for legislation which the Senate attached to unrelated legislation who claim now to be offended by that practice clearly have no logical or other basis on which to make that claim.

There are people who do not think we should add a very vulnerable category, particularly people who are transgender, to the hate crimes protection. They lost that fight when we had it in the House. I would have had it come up again, but it is clearly just another example of another time-tried practice.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I continue to scratch my head as I listen to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts who argues that just because the leadership of the House and the leadership of the Senate have followed the process time and again that the end justifies the means and that we ought to do it all the time.

But I would point out to the gentleman that this is not all the time. This is not a credit card bill. This is the national defense of the United States of America. It is our very freedoms. And we need to understand that just because some of us have had to vote on bills where we had no opportunity to debate them, where we didn't have time to read them and where we didn't have time to amend them doesn't make it right. And in this particular case, it doesn't make it right because the reality is only two individuals, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the chairman of

Senate Armed Services Committee, had to agree to put this in. They might be good men. They might have done it for good reasons. It was wrong. This is the only way to stop it.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas, the representative to the conference report, had we been able to have him meet earlier, Mr. GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate my friend from Massachusetts comparing the national parks bill to our national defense bill. But I see a real distinction in holding our soldiers' well-being hostage to this sociological attack on what used to be the morals of America. And for those who say this is critical, and I heard my friend from Georgia talking about how these crimes have increased, actually, the crimes, according to the FBI, have decreased regarding hate. So there are no statistics that demand this bill be attached and that our soldiers be held hostage for this bill.

And then we have the name of the bill, the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd Hate Crimes Prevention Act. Those were horrible murders, and the people who perpetrated them deserve, in my opinion, to get the death penalty all. But this bill does not provide a death penalty. In fact, this bill will not change the outcome of those cases one iota.

In the Texas case, James Byrd, it would be fine with me if we passed a bill that said when you do what was done to James Byrd, then the victim's family gets to choose the vehicle and the rope or chains by which they are going to drag the defendant to his death. But this doesn't do that. In the Matthew Shepard case, the defendants now say it was a robbery gone bad. Regardless, they got life sentences, a couple of life sentences. This bill wouldn't have changed that whatsoever at all either.

Now, there are those who say it will not affect religious speech; but when we have debated this bill and people have looked at it carefully, you see that this situation can arise: a preacher preaching from the Bible, a rabbi preaching from the Tanach, or an imam teaching from the Koran says in his opinion homosexuality is wrong. Some nut hears him, goes out and commits an act of violence, and when arrested says, well, I was induced to do this by the preacher, the imam or the rabbi.

Well, under 18 U.S.C. 2(a), it says that anyone who induces another to commit a crime is just as guilty as the one who committed it. That's where the preacher, the imam, or the rabbi could be arrested.

And I appreciate in prior debate my friend from Massachusetts pointed to the folks in Philadelphia and said, well, they were arrested but the charges were dropped. Arresting and detaining has a chilling effect. There's no two ways around it.

□ 1800

Mr. SKELTON. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. So little time, so many fallacies. The first fallacy is that we were not comparing the credit card bill to the defense bill; we were talking about a regular practice. It wasn't just the credit card bill. Regularly for years the Senate does this, and no Republican has ever risen to object to it. Their objection is not to the procedure, but to the substance. Nothing is being held hostage. The bill will pass or fail. If it failed because of this, it would come back without it.

Secondly, the gentleman's last point is simply nonsensical: one arrest that was inappropriate. There have been other inappropriate arrests. Hate crimes bills have been in effect, hate crimes laws, at the Federal and State level for years. There is zero example of that happening. There is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas that makes it impossible.

When people use wholly irrelevant arguments against the bill, it means that they can't find a real argument that they want to use.

Finally, the gentleman from California, the ranking member said, don't have these hate crimes, violence is violence, or one of the Members said that. I guess then he is opposed to that amendment which prohibits a tax on U.S. servicemen on account of service because that is in here. There is in here a provision that protects servicemen who are attacked on account of service. If you are opposed in principle to that, then you ought to be opposed to that in general.

It is clear there is an animus against those of us who are gay or lesbian, against people who are transgender, on the part of many in the House, and they are reflecting a strong political sentiment in the country. They are entitled to it. I do not lament the loss of their friendship and affection; I can live without it. But it should not lead them to deny protection to vulnerable people, and we are talking here about crimes, not just murder, but about assault and destruction of property which are too often ignored.

So let's be very clear. There is no consistency to the argument about the procedure. There is no consistency to the argument about hate crimes. There is no validity whatsoever to the argument that some clergy would be arrested or prosecuted because none have been. This is simply a declaration of unhappiness that gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender people are getting some protection.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, we can pound on the desk all day long. We can say stuff about consistency, but the reality is the American people understand what is going on. They understand that it doesn't make sense, no matter whether they like it or don't like it, to have a hate crimes legislation attached to the National Defense

Authorization bill. They understand that it doesn't make sense to put bills on the floor when people don't have an opportunity to read them before they vote on them.

They understand it doesn't make sense to not give time to amend bills. And, Mr. Speaker, they understand that when you go into a motion to go into conference at 5:36 and you have already begun writing the report and this is the only way to keep this bill clean for the defense of the country, that it makes sense that this motion to instruct would pass.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to my friend, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman from Missouri and let me particularly thank Chairman SKELTON for his open view as he fights for the men and women in the United States military. Your long years of history are appreciated, and I stand here to acknowledge that. Thank you for giving us this opportunity this afternoon.

I just want to say to my good friend from Virginia, to address the American people as we address our colleagues today, I count the American people as the smartest constituency that the world could know. They are compassionate. They are passionate. They are patriots. They love their country, and they understand a mother's love.

So let me explain to you procedurally so you would know that nothing has gone awry, has gone wrong, and no hostage-taking has taken place.

The hate crimes legislation, in particular named Matthew Shepard Hate Crimes Prevention Act, has been introduced and introduced and introduced in some form. Chairman CONYERS on the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, has introduced hate crimes legislation. I have introduced hate crimes legislation. We have seen hate crimes legislation pass 237-180, bipartisan.

But if you think of the armed services or the military authorization bill, just in your mind get a sense of the oath that our men and women of the United States military take as they affirm their allegiance to the United States. It is to protect every single citizen. Just this past weekend, I was privileged to be part of the send-off for the 72nd Combat Brigade in Texas, some 3,000 men and women as they take their oath, as they go off to be deployed, they are fighting for the freedom of this Nation.

The Matthew Shepard Hate Crimes legislation is about the freedom of every citizen. This was not an ordinary burglary. If you had the opportunity to meet Matthew Shepard's mother, as I have, as she pressed the case over and over again, this was a violent, heinous, hateful crime, the description of which was so painful for someone to be nailed on some open field fence to die with no

one there. That is a hate crime. And the Senate, who has reviewed and had the opportunity for hearings, as we had in the House, is doing nothing more than procedurally adding an already passed bill by both of these institutions that captures the characterization of what freedom in America is all about.

There have been 118,000 hate crimes since 1991, but the real key is most of the hate crimes go unreported. And they are all shapes and sizes. They are for race, they are for gender, and they are for sexual orientation. But every single one of these individuals is an American who is to be protected under the flag of the United States of America.

We do not ask citizens what their pedigree is. But if they are under this flag, they deserve our protection, and what better vehicle than this bill that has been reviewed and reviewed and reviewed and reviewed? The FBI knows that there have been hate crimes, and they are saddened by the fact that most of these hate crimes are not prevented and/or reported.

Just as we had attacks on churches some years ago because they were black churches, and we passed the Church Arson Prevention Act of 1996, it cured those church crimes because the Federal Government took its stand.

So I would say to my colleagues, understand the connection. What more is the United States military than the free and the brave protecting with courage any American that is within the boundaries of this Nation, giving them the sense that they can walk in dignity so mothers don't have to cry over brutalized bodies that are laid upon a fence because they are different.

I would ask my colleagues to oppose this conference motion and vote for the Matthew Shepard Hates Crimes Prevention Act so we can stand for freedom and bravery.

At one time lynchings were commonplace in our nation. Nearly 4,000 African-Americans were tortured and killed between 1880 and 1930. During this same period and thereafter, religious groups like Jews and the Mormons were also subject to attack because of their beliefs. As we all know too well, hate violence against minority groups—most recently focused on gay, transgender and Muslim communities—has a long and ignominious history that continues even today.

Bias crimes are disturbingly prevalent and pose a significant threat to the full participation of all Americans in our democratic society. The FBI has the best national data on reported hate crime, though the program is voluntary. Since 1991, the FBI has documented over 118,000 hate crimes. For the year 2007, the most current data available, the FBI compiled reports from law enforcement agencies across the country identifying 7,624 bias-motivated criminal incidents that were directed against an individual because of their personal characteristics.

As in the past, racially-motivated bias accounted for more than half (50.8%) of all incidents. Religious bias accounted for 1,400 incidents (18.4%) and sexual orientation bias accounted for 1,265 incidents—(16.6%), followed

by ethnicity/national origin bias with 1007 incidents—(13.2%). While these numbers are disturbing, it is important to note that, for a variety of reasons, hate crimes are seriously under-reported.

To protect the nation against this hate violence, I have introduced Hate Crimes legislation for many many years, with ever increasing support. This legislation will provide assistance to state and local law enforcement agencies and amend federal law to facilitate the investigation and prosecution of violent, bias-motivated crimes. Last Congress, this legislation was approved by this Committee and passed the House with bipartisan support by a vote of 237–180. Bipartisan majorities also voted in favor of hate crime legislation in the 109th, 108th and 106th Congresses.

The bill has attracted the support of over 300 civil rights, education, religious, and civic organizations (including the LCCR, HRC and ADL). Importantly, virtually every major law enforcement organization in the country has endorsed the bill—including the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National District Attorneys Association, the National Sheriffs Association, the Police Executive Research Forum, and 31 state Attorneys General.

Despite the deep impact of hate violence on communities, current law limits federal jurisdiction over hate crimes to incidents directed against individuals on the basis of race, religion, color or national origin—but only when the victim is targeted because he/she is engaged in a federally protected activities, such as voting. Further, the statutes do not permit federal involvement in a range of cases where crimes are motivated by bias against the victim's perceived sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, or disability. The federal government must have authority to be involved in investigating and prosecuting these crimes when state authorities cannot or will not do so.

This legislation will strengthen existing federal law in the same way that the Church Arson Prevention Act of 1996 helped federal prosecutors combat church arson: by addressing the unduly rigid jurisdictional requirements under federal law. The bill only applies to bias-motivated violent crimes and does not impinge public speech, religious expression, or writing in any way. In fact, the measure includes an explicit First Amendment free speech protection for the accused modeled on the existing Washington state hate crimes statute.

State and local authorities currently prosecute the overwhelming majority of hate crimes and will continue to do so under this legislation. The federal government will continue to defer to state and local authorities in the vast majority of cases; the Attorney General or other high ranking Justice Department official must approve any prosecutions undertaken pursuant to this law, ensuring federal restraint.

However, in appropriate circumstances, the federal government will be able to provide support for local prosecutions—an intergovernmental grant program created by this legislation will make Justice Department technical, forensic or prosecutorial assistance available. The legislation also authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to state and local law enforcement agencies that have incurred extraordinary expenses associated with the investigation and prosecution of hate crimes.

The Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 2009 is a constructive and

measured response to a problem that continues to plague our nation. Hate crime statistics do not speak for themselves. Behind each of the statistics is an individual or community targeted for violence for no other reason than race, religion, ethnicity, sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, or disability.

Law enforcement authorities and civic leaders have learned that a failure to address the problem of bias crime can cause a seemingly isolated incident to fester into wide spread tension that can damage the social fabric of the wider community. This problem cuts across party lines, and I am glad to be joined by so many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in supporting this legislation today. These are crimes that shock and shame our national conscience and should be subject to comprehensive federal law enforcement assistance and prosecution.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, the gentlelady from Texas makes a good point when she references the fact that Americans understand a mother's love, and they also understand a few other things. First of all, they understand fairness. They understand it is not fair when only two individuals get to make a choice that impacts all of America as opposed to having a bill voted on on its own merits.

They also understand when there is always this disconnect between the rhetoric over here—what's the problem—and the solution or the fix over here, and the huge disconnect between the two. And they also understand, Mr. Speaker, just something that so often it just seems that there is a dearth of here, and that is common sense. Because if the speakers keep coming up and saying how overwhelmingly this bill has support and would pass, why don't they bring it in a separate bill? Why do they have to go through this subterfuge of the process of putting it on a bill that clearly isn't germane?

I would like to just respond to the question that was raised: What better vehicle? This legislation has never been under the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee. It has always come under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, and the reason is because the proper vehicle is a vehicle that goes through the Judiciary Committee and is a separate bill.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SKELTON. Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, under the new title 18 of United States Code section 1389, one of the classifications is Prohibition on Attacks on U.S. Servicemen on Account of Service.

Let me also point out this legislation includes the Brownback amendment which fully protects religious speech under the First Amendment, which says that nothing in this bill will burden religious speech or expression, including sermons from the pulpit on Sundays.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN).

Ms. BALDWIN. Thank you, Chairman SKELTON.

I rise today in opposition to the minority's motion to instruct. As my colleagues know, hate crimes are acts of violence, motivated by hate and prejudice in which the victim is selected and targeted based upon a characteristic, such as their race, their religion, sexual orientation, or gender identity. Hate crimes have the consequence of harming not only their victims, but also all who share the same characteristics as the victim. Whole communities are terrorized by hate crimes.

In 1968 in response to horrific hate-based violence in our country, cross burnings, lynchings, fire bombings and the like, Congress acted to protect people who were targeted for violence on the basis of their race, color, religion, and national origin by passing our Nation's original hate crimes laws.

In April of this year, the House passed the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Act of 2009 by a strong and bipartisan margin, strengthening our response to this form of domestic terrorism by adding protections for people targeted for violence because of their gender, disability, gender identity, or sexual orientation. We sought to add these new categories to the hate crimes statutes because of a history and a pervasive pattern of heinous violent crimes committed against individuals because of these characteristics. Yet the Local Law Enforcement Hate Crimes Act of 2009 is not yet law, and this motion to instruct would prevent it from becoming law, despite the support of the majority of the House and the majority in the other body and President Obama.

Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you a few reasons why I believe this legislation must urgently be signed into law. I am thinking today of Angie Zapata, an 18-year-old transgender woman who was brutally murdered in Greeley, Colorado, last summer. Angie's killer beat her to death. Thankfully, Angie's killer was brought to justice under a State hate crimes law, but we know with staggering frequency, those who commit similar acts of violence and murder based on hate are not.

I think of Lawrence King, a 15-year-old in Oxnard, California. Larry had suffered harassment from his peers and then was killed by a 14-year-old classmate because of his sexual orientation and gender identity.

And I think today of Matthew Shepard who was brutally attacked by his homophobic assailants and left to die on a fence in Wyoming 10 years ago. Matthew's death generated international outrage by exposing the violent nature of hate crimes and the horrific effect upon targeted communities. And I think of the thousands of other victims of brutal hate crimes. The Department of Justice reported that over 1,500 Americans were victims of hate crimes based on sexual orientation in the year 2007.

Americans across the country, young and old alike, must hear Congress

clearly affirm that hate-based violence targeting gays and lesbians and transgender individuals, women, and people with disabilities will not be tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, the arguments have been made, the evidence has been proffered, and, sadly, lives have been lost that more than justify this legislation becoming law. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this motion to instruct.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will note the gentleman from Missouri has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I just want to respond to what the distinguished gentleman from Missouri said a moment ago, who is my dear friend and I hope will be my dear friend after today as well. He mentioned that this bill has a protection for individuals who were addressing their religious beliefs, and he mentioned that the Brownback amendment had been part of this, as I understood his referencing. In point of fact, the Brownback amendment nor the Leahy addition to the Brownback amendment contained what this report language says, which is this, Mr. Speaker. It says that they will be protected unless the government demonstrates that application of the burden to the person is in furtherance of a compelling government interest.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think most people across the country are going to trust that language to their religious protections, and I will just give you an example. The Constitution, which has no such limitations, also protects our right to freedom of religion, and yet 2 weeks ago we saw the government haul into Federal court for criminalization a principal who had worked in a school system 30 years and an athletic director for 40 years because of their great sin that they had a compelling government interest against, that they dared to ask a 15-second blessing over a meal.

□ 1815

And for that they went through an all-day hearing with the threat of 6 months in jail, a \$5,000 fine, and losing retirement benefits for 30 to 40 years. So I would just suggest, Mr. Speaker, this language is not nearly as protective as the Brownback amendment or the additional modifications in the Senate. And again, the only shot we have to change it will be right here, because the report's being written, and when it comes back it's going to be a take-it-or-leave-it basis. I hope that we will offer this instruction to the conferees.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. I yield 4 minutes to my friend, my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this motion to instruct conferees. For too long we have debated whether this Na-

tion should take a stand against the scourge of hate crimes, crimes of violence in which the victim has been singled out because of who he or she is. It is remarkable that at this late date this should remain a controversial idea. The idea that someone could be singled out for a crime of violence because of his or her actual or perceived race or religion or color or gender or sexual orientation or gender identity or disability is simply disgusting. These crimes are real and they're all too frequent. That is a fact. It is not, as some would have you believe, a hoax.

Here are the most recent statistics from the FBI. In 2007 there were 7,621 violent hate crimes, 51 percent because of racial bias, 18 percent because of religious bias, 17 percent sexual orientation bias, 13 percent because of ethnicity or national origin bias, and 1 percent because of a bias against a disability. Those are real Americans being victimized because of who they are and not for anything they did. And when you victimize someone for who they are you are terrorizing an entire community. It sends a clear and unmistakable message that members of that group are not safe in your community. It extends well beyond the individual victim.

This House has already spoken clearly. On April 29 of this year, a bipartisan majority voted by a margin of 248-175 to pass this legislation. I do not believe that Members of this House will now turn their backs on that historic vote. If you believe it was right to vote for this legislation, then you know you have the chance to make it law and to make history. The Hate Crimes Prevention Act will in no way undercut the other purposes of this Defense bill. In fact, by protecting all Americans from the scourge of violent hate crime, we will be making everyone more secure.

A new section added by the Senate prescribes severe penalties for anyone assaulting a member of our military or destroying their property because of that person's being a member of the Armed Forces. I happen to think that's an important addition. I hope there won't be a single Member of this House who will fail to support that provision against hate crimes against the military. I certainly think it belongs in this bill. I also want to be sure everyone understand that this bill contains express safeguards against prosecutions based on someone's speech or religious beliefs. This legislation applies only to acts of violence.

And despite the statement a moment ago, the fact that somebody ignorantly arrested someone against the law and that the charges were subsequently dismissed says nothing about the validity of the law. Every crime requires that the government prove some element of intent, and we punish crimes differently based on the criminal's intent. Shooting someone as a crime of passion is not treated the same way as shooting someone in a murder-for-hire

scheme, and it is certainly not the same as an accidental shooting. The law makes these distinctions, as it should. This does not make murder for hire a thought crime. Society simply judges such crimes more harshly, and it is right that we do so. It is the same with hate crimes. These are particularly disgusting crimes and they deserve to be treated differently than other assaults or murders. I realize that not everyone believes this, but there is a growing social consensus on this point, both in the States and at the national level.

For many years this Congress sat on its hands and refused to pass anti-lynching laws. Many of the same arguments we heard then against anti-lynching laws we are hearing now against this provision. It was a disgrace then. It is a disgrace now. It was a disgrace that we did not act then. It would be a disgrace if we do not act now. It would be a disgrace if we pass this motion to instruct conferees. I urge rejection of this motion.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from New York is very conversant on this topic, as well he should be, because he sits on the Judiciary Committee, where this legislation normally comes, and I think that's where it properly should be. However, I would suggest two things. First of all, that the very rule of law that will be needed to enforce these provisions becomes meaningless when you look at the administration's refusal to comply with the law to even give the information needed to vote on this conference report, as they did by refusing to give the shipbuilding plan and the certification of the aviation plan and the certification.

And then to make the statement that the fact that someone improperly charges someone says nothing about the law misses the whole chilling effect that that has. When you have that possibility out there, many individuals are then very concerned about exercising their rights because they're concerned even if it's improperly, that the government will come in and do something that they're going to have to spend thousands and thousands of dollars and have that hanging over their head just to prove what they should never have had to prove.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SKELTON. I have no more speakers, but I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. AKIN).

Mr. AKIN. Mr. Speaker, I have sat here and listened to this debate, and I've heard all kinds of reasons why the hate crimes bill is so wonderful. But the more they make the argument, the more confusing the question becomes. If this bill is so wonderful, why don't we bring it to the floor and just vote on it and pass it? Why, instead, are we going to stick this bill together with a

bill for funding our national defense? The two don't belong together. They're not in the same committee. They have nothing to do with each other. What they have in common though is the fact that, instead of taking a straight-up vote, what we're going to do is we're going to hold everybody who depends on national defense, the people such as myself, who has a son going to Afghanistan in 3 weeks, they're going to hold us hostage.

We're going say, look, if you want to fund the national defense of the United States of America, you're also going to have to vote for this hate crimes bill. And one thing that my good friend from Virginia has made clear, and that is the public is starting to see through the shenanigans that go on in this place. And this is an extremely frustrating situation. It wasn't so many weeks ago that at 3 o'clock in the morning we passed a 300-page amendment to a bill that we were discussing the next day, and there wasn't even a copy of that bill in this Chamber, the cap-and-tax bill.

And here we are, again, with a bill which is on national defense. It's actually a fairly decent bill on national defense, and we're going to stick on this something that has nothing to do with it. I could speak on hate crimes, but the point of the matter is if everybody's who's saying hate crimes is such an important piece of legislation, let's bring it up on its own bases. Let's see if it will stand on its own base.

No, instead what we're going to do is we're going to sneak it through, and we're going to put it in so that anybody who wants to vote for national defense now is stuck having to support hate crimes. This is not the way this House should be run. The American public doesn't like to care about procedure, but they're getting fed up with this.

Mr. SKELTON. How much time do I have remaining, please?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Virginia has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman from California (Mr. McKEON) for his efforts in the Defense authorization bill this year. It's important that I do so because he's been a great partner. He's been jumping in with both feet as ranking member from the day he began serving as ranking member. At a time when the Department of Defense is fighting two wars and simultaneously promoting and serving America's strategic interests around the world, I'm proud to say that our Congress is nearing completion on a strong and effective Defense authorization bill.

The bill that this House approved overwhelmingly on June 25, like its Senate counterpart, reflects the Congress' deep commitment in supporting American servicemembers and providing the necessary resources to keep

our Americans safe. Both bills provide our military personnel with a 3.4 percent pay raise, an increase of .5 percent above the President's request. The House bill also includes a number of initiatives to support military families this year, which, of course, is the Year of the Military Family. We fully fund the President's overall budget request, and worked hard to provide robust funding for military training, equipment, maintenance and facilities upkeep.

The House bill continues the commitment to oversight of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, which has been a hallmark of our committee, as well as personal pride on my behalf. The bill also works to equip and modernize our military forces and extend our acquisition reform efforts which we passed a substantial bill here earlier this year.

With that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank the chairman for yielding. It is certainly important to look at the procedure, Mr. Speaker, by which any piece of legislation comes to the floor. But I think it's more important to look at the substance. And hopefully later this week, this body will have an opportunity to work its will on a piece of legislation that strengthens our country, that increases what we pay our troops, that improves the respect that we show to their families, that protects our country against threats, both present and in the future. Now, the purpose of what's on the floor right now is to make a procedural point about whether or not legislation that deals to protect Americans against hate crimes should or should not be included. I believe that should be. And I think those who would argue that there's something irregular or unfair about that procedure are respectfully incorrect in two respects.

The first is that before such a provision would be included in the final conference report before this House, the House will have to work its will on a rule. And if a majority of the Members believe that that rule is fair, then we will proceed. If a majority of Members believe the rule is not fair, we will not and have a different procedural setting. So there will be that opportunity for every Member of this House to take his or her position. Secondly, the hate crimes legislation has been thoroughly vetted in this Congress in hearings before the committees of jurisdiction, in markups in those committees and voting sessions in those committees, and on this floor repeatedly. There's nothing new, undebated, untested or unusual in the substantive legislation that will be before us.

So I believe that the right thing to do is to proceed with the plan that would include this legislation. But frankly, the majority of this House will get the chance to work its will as to whether we do that or not. I, for one, will be voting to proceed on that basis. Those who disagree will have a chance

to have their day on this floor, and the majority will work its will.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we had one friend across the aisle cite the 2007 statistics. The trouble is you go back 10 years, 20 years and you see that the crimes being conducted, taking place based on any type of hatred, are diminishing, so that is not a valid argument. There are no limitations on the definitions. There should have been. In committees, we tried to get them so pedophiles would be included. But we had another friend say, this is only about acts of violence. And as my friend here from Virginia pointed out, there is an "unless" there. And that's where the law principles, 18 U.S.C. 18(a), comes into play. If you induce someone to commit a crime, that's the government interest; it will be used, and that's why you heard a national anchorperson say about the Matthew Shepherd crimes, Gee, I wonder if people like James Dobson induced that crime. This is not where we need to go in defense of this country.

□ 1830

Mr. SKELTON. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, we heard the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey essentially say this: It's more important to look at the substance of the bill than to worry about the rules. And how many of us have been tempted to ask that same question throughout our lives—isn't it more important that I look at the end than I consider the means?

But, Mr. Speaker, I plead with us, be careful when you go there, because those rules are designed to protect the majority and to protect the minority. And when we start saying, The rules don't matter; the process doesn't matter; it's just the end game, we get to where we're moving to in this country.

I want to come back to what the distinguished gentleman, the ranking member of the Armed Services Committee from California, said. I didn't hear my good friend, the chairman of the committee, correct him—so I must assume it's correct—when he said that both of them agreed that this legislation should not be in the conference report.

If in fact that is true, Mr. Speaker, and I have no reason to doubt it, then why is it in here? We have to ask, Why place it in here?

Mr. Speaker, I come back because here's what we're going to hear. There's going to be people that come in here and they're going to recount over and over again all the great things that are in this bill and why can't we just do

one thing that shouldn't be in the bill and one thing that's wrong.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to come back and I want to tell you a story about an individual that I knew 20, 30 years ago. He was a big, strapping guy. He was a football player. And I remember talking to him years before when I was in college. He had never told me the story.

One day he came up and he said that he had watched as he came into his house when he was a young boy over and over again and his father would come in and his father would end up slapping his mother in the face and sometimes hitting her. And he would sit there in awe at that process, watching it happen. And every time, as the father looked to the children, he'd then back off and he would say, Wait a minute. I'm sorry. That was a bad thing to do. But remember all the good things I've done. Remember, I went to work today and I earned money and I brought it in here and I put it on the table so that you could eat. I paid for your Christmas presents. I'm saving money for your college tuition. Remember the good things and overlook that bad thing.

And day after day and month after month he watched that, until all of sudden he became a senior in high school and he had picked up a lot of stature. One day, his father walked into the house and slapped his mother. And he stood up and the man turned around to him and said, Remember; remember all the good things that I've done. And he started recounting them.

And that young senior reached over and picked up his father and said, There aren't enough good things in the world to justify what you've done to my mother. And, Mr. Speaker, he looked at the door and he opened it and he said, You go out that door and don't ever come back again. And that's what his father ended up doing.

Mr. Speaker, I would say today, all across America, Americans are standing up and they're looking at us and they're tired of us walking in here and saying, Forget the bad things we're doing. Forget what we're doing to America. Remember the good things. Look at this; look at this; look at this.

And one day, I don't know when it's going to come, but they're going to stand up with the stature and look us in the eye and they're going to say, There aren't enough good things in the world to justify what you're doing to America and to my country. There's the door. You go out and don't come back.

Mr. Speaker, I only pray that that comes sooner rather than later so that we have a country that they remember.

This is wrong. I hope that we will pass this motion to instruct.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2997, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2010

Mr. PERLMUTTER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 111-287) on the resolution (H. Res. 799) providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2997) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 2647, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, I move that meetings of the conference between the House and the Senate on H.R. 2647 may be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information may be broached, provided that any sitting Member of Congress shall be entitled to attend any meeting of the conference.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, the motion is not debatable, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to authorize closure of conference meetings will be followed by 5-minute votes on the motion to instruct conferees and suspending the rules with regard to House Resolution 707.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 7, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 753]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie	Austria	Bean
Ackerman	Baca	Becerra
Aderholt	Bachmann	Berkley
Adler (NJ)	Bachus	Berman
Akin	Baird	Berry
Alexander	Baldwin	Biggart
Altmire	Barrow	Bilbray
Andrews	Bartlett	Bilirakis
Arcuri	Barton (TX)	Bishop (GA)

Bishop (NY)	Foster	Lujan	Ruppersberger	Sires	Towns	Calvert	Issa	Poe (TX)
Bishop (UT)	Fox	Lummis	Rush	Skelton	Tsongas	Camp	Jenkins	Posey
Blackburn	Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel	Ryan (OH)	Slaughter	Turner	Campbell	Johnson (IL)	Price (GA)
Blunt	Franks (AZ)	E.	Ryan (WI)	Smith (NE)	Upton	Cantor	Jones	Putnam
Bocieri	Frelinghuysen	Lynch	Salazar	Smith (NJ)	Van Hollen	Capito	Jordan (OH)	Radanovich
Boehner	Fudge	Mack	Sánchez, Linda	Smith (TX)	Velázquez	Carter	King (NY)	Rehberg
Bonner	Gallegly	Maffei	T.	Smith (WA)	Walden	Chaffetz	Kingston	Roe (TN)
Bono Mack	Garrett (NJ)	Manzullo	Sanchez, Loretta	Snyder	Walz	Childers	Kline (MN)	Rogers (AL)
Boozman	Giffords	Marchant	Sarbanes	Souder	Wamp	Coble	Kratovil	Rogers (KY)
Boren	Gingrey (GA)	Markey (CO)	Scalise	Space	Wasserman	Coffman (CO)	Lamborn	Rogers (MI)
Boswell	Gohmert	Markey (MA)	Schakowsky	Speier	Schultz	Cole	Lance	Rooney
Boucher	Gonzalez	Marshall	Schauer	Spratt	Waters	Conaway	Latham	Roskam
Boustany	Goodlatte	Massa	Schiff	Stearns	Watson	Culberson	LaTourette	Ross
Boyd	Gordon (TN)	Matheson	Schmidt	Stupak	Watt	Davis (AL)	Latta	Royce
Brady (PA)	Granger	Matsui	Schock	Sullivan	Waxman	Davis (KY)	Lee (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Brady (TX)	Graves	McCarthy (CA)	Schrader	Sutton	Weiner	Davis (TN)	Lewis (CA)	Scalise
Braley (IA)	Grayson	McCarthy (NY)	Tanner	Tanner	Welch	Deal (GA)	Linder	Schmidt
Bright	Green, Al	McCaul	Scott (GA)	Taylor	Westmoreland	Donnelly (IN)	LoBiondo	Schock
Broun (GA)	Green, Gene	McClintock	Scott (VA)	Teague	Wexler	Dreier	Lucas	Scott (VA)
Brown (SC)	Griffith	McCollum	Sensenbrenner	Terry	Whitfield	Duncan	Luetkemeyer	Sensenbrenner
Brown-Waite,	Grijalva	McCotter	Serrano	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (OH)	Edwards (TX)	Lummis	Sessions
Ginny	Guthrie	McGovern	Sessions	Thompson (MS)	Wilson (SC)	Ehlers	Lungren, Daniel	Shadegg
Buchanan	Gutierrez	McHenry	Sestak	Thompson (PA)	Wittman	Ellsworth	E.	Shuler
Burgess	Hall (NY)	McIntyre	Shadegg	Thornberry	Wolf	Emerson	Mack	Shuster
Burton (IN)	Hall (TX)	McKeon	Shea-Porter	Tiahrt	Woolsey	Fallin	Manzullo	Simpson
Butterfield	Halvorson	McMahon	Sherman	Tiberi	Wu	Flake	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Buyer	Hare	McMorris	Shuster	Tierney	Yarmuth	Fleming	Marshall	Smith (NJ)
Calvert	Harman	Rodgers	Simpson	Titus	Young (AK)	Forbes	McCarthy (CA)	Smith (TX)
Camp	Harper	McNerney		Tonko	Young (FL)	Fortenberry	McCaul	
Campbell	Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)				Fox	McClintock	Souder
Cantor	Hastings (WA)	Melancon				Franks (AZ)	McCotter	Stearns
Cao	Heinrich	Mica				Frelinghuysen	McHenry	Sullivan
Capito	Heller	Michaud				Gallegly	McIntyre	Tanner
Capps	Hensarling	Miller (FL)				Garrett (NJ)	McKeon	Taylor
Cardoza	Herger	Miller (MI)				Gingrey (GA)	McMorris	Teague
Carnahan	Herseht Sandlin	Miller (NC)				Gohmert	Rodgers	Terry
Carson (IN)	Higgins	Miller, Gary				Goodlatte	Mica	Thompson (PA)
Carter	Hill	Miller, George				Gordon (TN)	Miller (FL)	Thornberry
Cassidy	Himes	Minnick				Granger	Miller (MI)	Tiahrt
Castle	Hinche	Mitchell				Graves	Miller, Gary	Tiberi
Castor (FL)	Hirono	Mollohan				Griffith	Moran (KS)	Turner
Chaffetz	Hodes	Moore (KS)				Guthrie	Murphy (NY)	Upton
Chandler	Hoekstra	Moore (WI)				Hall (TX)	Murphy, Tim	Wamp
Childers	Holden	Moran (KS)				Harper	Myrick	Westmoreland
Chu	Holt	Murphy (CT)				Hastings (WA)	Nunes	Whitfield
Clarke	Honda	Murphy (NY)				Heller	Paul	Wilson (SC)
Clay	Hoyer	Murphy, Patrick				Hensarling	Paulsen	Wittman
Cleaver	Hunter	Murphy, Tim				Herger	Pence	Wolf
Clyburn	Inglis	Murtha				Hoekstra	Peterson	Young (AK)
Coble	Inslee	Myrick				Hunter	Petri	Young (FL)
Coffman (CO)	Israel	Nadler (NY)				Inglis	Pitts	
Cohen	Issa	Napolitano						
Cole	Jackson (IL)	Neal (MA)						
Conaway	Jackson-Lee	Nunes						
Connolly (VA)	(TX)	Nye						
Conyers	Jenkins	Oberstar						
Cooper	Johnson (GA)	Obey						
Costello	Johnson, E. B.	Olver						
Courtney	Jones	Ortiz						
Crowley	Jordan (OH)	Pallone						
Cuellar	Kagen	Pascarell						
Culberson	Kanjorski	Pastor (AZ)						
Cummings	Kaptur	Paulsen						
Dahlkemper	Kennedy	Payne						
Davis (AL)	Kildee	Pence						
Davis (CA)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Perlmutter						
Davis (IL)	Kilroy	Perriello						
Davis (KY)	Kind	Peters						
Davis (TN)	King (IA)	Peterson						
Deal (GA)	King (NY)	Petri						
DeGette	Kingston	Pingree (ME)						
Delahunt	Kirk	Pitts						
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Platts						
Dent	Kissell	Poe (TX)						
Dicks	Klein (FL)	Polis (CO)						
Dingell	Kline (MN)	Pomeroy						
Doggett	Kosmas	Posey						
Donnelly (IN)	Kratovil	Price (GA)						
Doyle	Lamborn	Price (NC)						
Dreier	Lance	Putnam						
Drieaus	Langevin	Quigley						
Duncan	Larsen (WA)	Radanovich						
Edwards (MD)	Larsen (CT)	Rahall						
Edwards (TX)	Latham	Rangel						
Ehlers	LaTourette	Rehberg						
Ellison	Latta	Reichert						
Ellsworth	Lee (CA)	Reyes						
Emerson	Lee (NY)	Richardson						
Engel	Levin	Rodriguez						
Eshoo	Lewis (CA)	Roe (TN)						
Etheridge	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (AL)						
Fallin	Linder	Rogers (KY)						
Farr	Lipinski	Rogers (MI)						
Fattah	LoBiondo	Rooney						
Filner	Loebach	Roskam						
Flake	Lofgren, Zoe	Ross						
Fleming	Lowey	Rothman (NJ)						
Forbes	Lucas	Roybal-Allard						
Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer	Royce						

NAYS—7

NOT VOTING—20

□ 1903

Messrs. PAUL and McDERMOTT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2647, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to instruct on H.R. 2647 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 178, nays 234, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 754]

YEAS—178

Aderholt	Bilirakis	Brady (TX)
Akin	Bishop (UT)	Bright
Alexander	Blackburn	Brown (GA)
Austria	Blunt	Brown (SC)
Bachmann	Boehner	Brown-Waite,
Bachus	Bonner	Ginny
Bartlett	Bono Mack	Buchanan
Barton (TX)	Boozman	Burgess
Berry	Boren	Burton (IN)
Bilbray	Boustany	Buyer

Abercrombie	Crowley	Hodes
Ackerman	Cuellar	Holden
Adler (NJ)	Cummings	Holt
Altmire	Dahlkemper	Honda
Andrews	Davis (CA)	Hoyer
Arcuri	Davis (IL)	Inslee
Baca	DeFazio	Israel
Baird	DeGette	Jackson (IL)
Baldwin	Delahunt	Jackson-Lee
Barrow	DeLauro	(TX)
Bean	Dent	Johnson (GA)
Becerra	Dicks	Johnson, E. B.
Berkley	Dingell	Kagen
Berman	Doggett	Kanjorski
Biggert	Doyle	Kaptur
Bishop (GA)	Drieaus	Kennedy
Bishop (NY)	Edwards (MD)	Kildee
Blumenauer	Ellison	Kilpatrick (MI)
Bocieri	Engel	Kilroy
Boswell	Eshoo	Kind
Boucher	Etheridge	Kirk
Boyd	Farr	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Brady (PA)	Fattah	Kissell
Braley (IA)	Filner	Klein (FL)
Butterfield	Foster	Kosmas
Cao	Frank (MA)	Kucinich
Capps	Fudge	Langevin
Cardoza	Giffords	Larsen (WA)
Carnahan	Gonzalez	Larsen (CT)
Carson (IN)	Grayson	Lee (CA)
Cassidy	Green, Al	Levin
Castle	Green, Gene	Lewis (GA)
Castor (FL)	Grijalva	Lipinski
Chandler	Gutierrez	Loebach
Chu	Hall (NY)	Lofgren, Zoe
Clarke	Halvorson	Lowey
Clay	Hare	Lujan
Cleaver	Harman	Lynch
Clyburn	Hastings (FL)	Maffei
Cohen	Heinrich	Markey (CO)
Connolly (VA)	Herseht Sandlin	Markey (MA)
Conyers	Higgins	Massa
Cooper	Hill	Matheson
Costa	Himes	Matsui
Costello	Hinche	McCarthy (NY)
Courtney	Hirono	McCollum

McDermott	Platts	Slaughter	Bachus	Duncan	Lance	Price (GA)	Schwartz	Thornberry
McGovern	Polis (CO)	Smith (WA)	Baird	Edwards (MD)	Langevin	Price (NC)	Scott (GA)	Tiahrt
McMahon	Pomeroy	Snyder	Baldwin	Edwards (TX)	Larsen (WA)	Putnam	Scott (VA)	Tiberi
McNerney	Price (NC)	Space	Barrow	Ehlers	Larson (CT)	Quigley	Sensenbrenner	Tierney
Meeks (NY)	Quigley	Speier	Barlett	Ellison	Latham	Rahall	Serrano	Titus
Melancon	Rahall	Spratt	Barton (TX)	Ellsworth	LaTourette	Rangel	Sessions	Tonko
Michaud	Rangel	Stark	Bean	Emerson	Latta	Rehberg	Sestak	Towns
Miller (NC)	Reichert	Stupak	Becerra	Engel	Lee (CA)	Reichert	Shadegg	Tsongas
Miller, George	Reyes	Sutton	Berkley	Eshoo	Lee (NY)	Reyes	Shea-Porter	Turner
Minnick	Richardson	Thompson (CA)	Berman	Etheridge	Levin	Richardson	Sherman	Upton
Mitchell	Rodriguez	Thompson (MS)	Berry	Fallin	Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez	Shuler	Van Hollen
Mollohan	Rothman (NJ)	Tierney	Biggert	Farr	Lewis (GA)	Roe (TN)	Shuster	Velázquez
Moore (KS)	Roybal-Allard	Titus	Bilbray	Fattah	Linder	Rogers (AL)	Simpson	Walden
Moore (WI)	Ruppersberger	Tonko	Bilirakis	Filner	Lipinski	Rogers (KY)	Sires	Walz
Murphy (CT)	Rush	Towns	Bishop (GA)	Flake	LoBiondo	Rogers (MI)	Skelton	Wamp
Murphy, Patrick	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas	Bishop (NY)	Fleming	Loeback	Rooney	Slaughter	Wasserman
Murtha	Salazar	Van Hollen	Bishop (UT)	Forbes	Lofgren, Zoe	Roskam	Smith (NE)	Schultz
Nadler (NY)	Sánchez, Linda	Velázquez	Blackburn	Fortenberry	Lowey	Ross	Smith (NJ)	Waters
Napolitano	T.	Walden	Blumenauer	Foster	Lucas	Rothman (NJ)	Smith (TX)	Watson
Neal (MA)	Sanchez, Loretta	Walz	Blunt	Fox	Luetkemeyer	Roybal-Allard	Smith (WA)	Watt
Nye	Sarbanes	Wasserman	Boccieri	Frank (MA)	Luján	Royce	Snyder	Waxman
Oberstar	Schakowsky	Schultz	Boehner	Frank (AZ)	Lummis	Ruppersberger	Souder	Weiner
Obey	Schauer	Waters	Bonner	Frelinghuysen	Lungren, Daniel	Rush	Space	Welch
Olver	Schiff	Watson	Bono Mack	Fudge	E.	Ryan (OH)	Speier	Westmoreland
Ortiz	Schrader	Watt	Boozman	Gallegly	Lynch	Ryan (WI)	Spratt	Whitfield
Pallone	Schwartz	Waxman	Boren	Garrett (NJ)	Mack	Salazar	Stark	Wilson (OH)
Pascrell	Scott (GA)	Weiner	Bowell	Giffords	Maffei	Sánchez, Linda	Stearns	Wilson (SC)
Pastor (AZ)	Serrano	Welch	Boucher	Gingrey (GA)	Manzullo	T.	Stupak	Wittman
Payne	Sestak	Wexler	Boustany	Gohmert	Marchant	Sanchez, Loretta	Sullivan	Wolf
Perlmutter	Shea-Porter	Wilson (OH)	Boyd	Gonzalez	Markey (CO)	Sarbanes	Sutton	Woolsey
Perriello	Sherman	Woolsey	Brady (PA)	Goodlatte	Markey (MA)	Scalise	Tanner	Wu
Peters	Sires	Wu	Brady (TX)	Gordon (TN)	Marshall	Schakowsky	Taylor	Yarmuth
Pingree (ME)	Skelton	Yarmuth	Braley (IA)	Granger	Massa	Schauer	Teague	Young (AK)
			Bright	Graves	Matheson	Schiff	Terry	Young (FL)
			Broun (GA)	Grayson	Matsui	Schmidt	Thompson (CA)	
			Brown (SC)	Green, Al	McCarthy (CA)	Schock	Thompson (MS)	
			Brown-Waite,	Green, Gene	McCarthy (NY)	Schrader	Thompson (PA)	
			Ginny	Griffith	McCaul			
			Buchanan	Grijalva	McClintock			
			Burgess	Guthrie	McCollum			
			Burton (IN)	Gutierrez	McCotter			
			Butterfield	Hall (NY)	McDermott			
			Buyer	Hall (TX)	McGovern			
			Calvert	Halvorson	McHenry			
			Camp	Hare	McIntyre			
			Campbell	Harman	McKeon			
			Cantor	Harper	McMahon			
			Cao	Hastings (FL)	McMorris			
			Capito	Hastings (WA)	Rodgers			
			Capps	Heinrich	McNerney			
			Cardoza	Heller	Meeks (NY)			
			Carnahan	Hensarling	Melancon			
			Carson (IN)	Herger	Mica			
			Carter	Hereth Sandlin	Michaud			
			Cassidy	Higgins	Miller (FL)			
			Castle	Hill	Miller (MI)			
			Castor (FL)	Himes	Miller (NC)			
			Chaffetz	Hinchey	Miller, Gary			
			Chandler	Hirono	Miller, George			
			Childers	Hodes	Minnick			
			Chu	Hoekstra	Mitchell			
			Clarke	Holden	Mollohan			
			Clay	Holt	Moore (KS)			
			Cleaver	Honda	Moore (WI)			
			Clyburn	Hoyer	Moran (KS)			
			Coble	Hunter	Murphy (CT)			
			Coffman (CO)	Inglis	Murphy (NY)			
			Cohen	Inslee	Murphy, Patrick			
			Cole	Israel	Murphy, Tim			
			Conaway	Issa	Murtha			
			Connolly (VA)	Jackson (IL)	Myrick			
			Conyers	Jackson-Lee	Nadler (NY)			
			Cooper	(TX)	Napolitano			
			Costa	Jenkins	Neal (MA)			
			Costello	Johnson (GA)	Nunes			
			Courtney	Johnson (IL)	Nye			
			Crowley	Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar			
			Cuellar	Jones	Obey			
			Culberson	Jordan (OH)	Olver			
			Cummings	Kagen	Ortiz			
			Dahlkemper	Kanjorski	Pallone			
			Davis (AL)	Kaptur	Pascrell			
			Davis (CA)	Kennedy	Pastor (AZ)			
			Davis (IL)	Kildee	Paul			
			Davis (KY)	Kilpatrick (MI)	Paulsen			
			Davis (TN)	Kilroy	Payne			
			Deal (GA)	Kind	Pence			
			DeFazio	King (IA)	Perlmutter			
			DeGette	King (NY)	Perriello			
			DeLauro	Kingston	Peters			
			Dent	Kirk	Peterson			
			Dicks	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Petri			
			Dingell	Kissell	Pingree (ME)			
			Doggett	Klein (FL)	Pitts			
			Donnelly (IN)	Kline (MN)	Platts			
			Doyle	Kosmas	Poe (TX)			
			Dreier	Kratovil	Polis (CO)			
			Driehaus	Kucinich	Pomeroy			
				Lamborn	Posey			

NOT VOTING—20

Barrett (SC)	Gerlach	Neugebauer
Brown, Corrine	Hinojosa	Olson
Capuano	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Carney	King (IA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Crenshaw	Maloney	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart, L.	Meek (FL)	Visclosky
Diaz-Balart, M.	Moran (VA)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1911

Ms. WATERS changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Conferees on H.R. 2647 will be appointed at a later time.

SUPPORTING NATIONAL ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 707, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 707, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 755]

YEAS—412

Abercrombie	Akin	Arcuri
Ackerman	Alexander	Austria
Aderholt	Altmire	Baca
Adler (NJ)	Andrews	Bachmann

NOT VOTING—20

Barrett (SC)	Gerlach	Olson
Brown, Corrine	Hinojosa	Radanovich
Capuano	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Carney	Maloney	Ros-Lehtinen
Crenshaw	Meek (FL)	Shimkus
Diaz-Balart, L.	Moran (VA)	Visclosky
Diaz-Balart, M.	Neugebauer	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. HALVORSON) (during the vote). Two minutes are remaining.

□ 1918

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “Resolution expressing support for designation of the week of October 18, 2009, as National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE ACCEPTANCE OF A STATUE OF HELEN KELLER, PRESENTED BY THE PEOPLE OF ALABAMA

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 42 and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAFFEI). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

S. CON. RES. 42

Whereas Helen Keller was born in Tusculumbia, Alabama on June 27, 1880, and at

the age of 19 months lost her sight and hearing as a result of meningitis;

Whereas Helen was liberated from the "double dungeon of darkness and silence" by her teacher, Anne Sullivan, when she discovered language and communication at the water pump when she was 7 years old;

Whereas Helen enrolled in Radcliffe College in 1900 and graduated cum laude in 1904 to become the first deaf and blind college graduate;

Whereas Helen's life served as a model for all people with disabilities in America and worldwide;

Whereas Helen became recognized as one of Alabama's and America's best known figures and became "America's Goodwill Ambassador to the World";

Whereas Helen pioneered the concept of "talking books" for the blind;

Whereas LIFE Magazine hailed Helen as "one of the 100 most important Americans of the 20th Century—a national treasure"; and

Whereas Helen's presence in the Capitol will become an even greater inspiration for people with disabilities worldwide: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That—

SECTION 1. ACCEPTANCE OF HELEN KELLER, FROM THE PEOPLE OF ALABAMA, FOR PLACEMENT IN THE CAPITOL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The statue of Helen Keller, furnished by the people of Alabama for placement in the Capitol, in accordance with section 1814 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 2131), is accepted in the name of the United States, and the thanks of Congress are tendered to the people of Alabama for providing this commemoration of one of Alabama's most eminent personages.

(b) PRESENTATION CEREMONY.—The State of Alabama is authorized to use the Rotunda of the Capitol on October 7, 2009, for a presentation ceremony for the statue. The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board shall take such action as may be necessary with respect to physical preparations and security for the ceremony.

(c) DISPLAY IN ROTUNDA.—The Architect of the Capitol shall provide for the display of the statue accepted under this section in the Rotunda of the Capitol for a period of not more than 6 months, after which period the statue shall be displayed in the Capitol, in accordance with the procedures described in section 311(e) of the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2001 (2 U.S.C. 2132(e)).

SEC. 2. TRANSMITTAL TO GOVERNOR OF ALABAMA.

The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit an enrolled copy of this concurrent resolution to the Governor of Alabama.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HONORING PRIVATE FIRST CLASS BRANDON A. OWENS

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, the United States of America and my hometown of Memphis lost one of its finest citizens, a brave soldier fighting in Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan.

Private First Class Brandon A. Owens was 21 years of age when he died of injuries sustained from small-arms

fire. His unit, the 118th Military Police Company, 503rd Military Police Battalion, from Fort Bragg, North Carolina, was stationed in Wardak province when it was attacked by enemy forces.

Prior to joining the Army, Private First Class Owens attended Wooddale High School in Memphis, where he played on the basketball team. He was a very well-liked gentleman, small in stature but big in heart.

Private First Class Owens is survived by his parents Eric and Lynda Owens of Memphis.

Let us take a moment to remember the sacrifice he made for the stability of Afghanistan and the protection of its people.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time, and I thank the Owens family for their son. He paid the ultimate sacrifice, and I will join with his family in mourning this weekend.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AUTISM IS NEEDED

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, we have had an epidemic of autism for a long time in this country. It used to be 1 in 10,000 was autistic; then it went to 1 in 150; and in the Journal of Pediatrics this week, they said now more than 1 in 100 children are autistic. Something has to be done about that.

I believe one of the root causes is the mercury that's in the vaccinations that we're giving, the preservative called Thimerosal.

But even if you don't agree with me on that, we really need to get to the bottom of why so many children are suffering from this epidemic of autism. So we have a bill, H.R. 3703, which calls on the President to have a White House conference on autism to try to get to the bottom of this as quickly as possible.

These children are going to grow up; they are going to live long lives; they're going to be a real problem for themselves, their families, and the country. We've got to come to the realization that we have to find a cure for autism and to stop it. We need to do this now. We need this White House conference, and I urge my colleagues to join me in sponsoring this bill, H.R. 3703.

[Oct. 5, 2009]

STUDY: MORE CASES OF AUTISM IN U.S. KIDS THAN PREVIOUSLY REALIZED: 1 IN 100

(CNN).—A study published Monday in the journal Pediatrics indicates about 1 percent of children ages 3 to 17 have autism or a related disorder, an increase over previous estimates.

"This is a significant issue that needs immediate attention," Dr. Heena Arias, deputy director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention said Friday. "A concerted effort and substantial national response is warranted."

The study used data from the federal government's 2007 national survey of children's

health. The survey of parents was conducted by the Health Resources and Services Administration, and by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

The results are based on a national telephone survey of more than 78,000 parents of children ages 3 to 17. iReport.com: How has autism affected your family?

In the study, parents were asked whether a health care provider had ever told them their child had an autism spectrum disorder. ASD is a group of brain disorders comprising autism and two less severe disorders: Asperger's disorder and pervasive developmental disorder not otherwise specified.

Children with the disorder show impairment in social interaction and in their ability to communicate. They often display repetitive behavior.

The investigators also asked a follow-up question: Were the children considered to have ASD now? Nearly 40 percent of the parents and guardians said no.

That finding led the authors to question whether some of the children originally diagnosed as having ASD may have been improperly diagnosed, since the disorders are not considered curable.

But Kogan said the two surveys cannot be compared because the earlier investigators did not ask the follow-up question about whether the children were still considered to have the disorder.

Still, based on the findings, lead author Dr. Michael D. Kogan of HRSA's maternal and child health bureau estimated the prevalence of ASD among U.S. children ages 3 to 17 at 110 per 10,000—slightly more than 1 percent.

Boys were four times as likely as girls to have ASD, and non-Hispanic black and multiracial children were less likely than non-Hispanic white children.

He estimated that 673,000 children have ASD in the United States.

Monday's findings of nearly 1 in 100 appear to indicate an increase from the average of 1 in 150 that was reported in 2003, the researchers said.

The researchers urged caution in interpreting the change, noting that an increase in diagnoses does not necessarily mean that more children have the disorder. It could simply reflect a heightened awareness of the disorder.

"We don't know whether the change in the number over time is a result of the change in the actual condition, in the actual number of conditions or in part due to the fact that the condition is being recognized differently," Arias said.

She said that preliminary results from a separate, CDC-funded study she is working on also indicate that about 1 percent of children in the United States are affected by ASD. That study is to be published later this year, she said.

"This is a behavioral diagnosis, and it's difficult to make, and it's difficult to make at young ages," said Dr. Peter van Dyck, HRSA's associate administrator for maternal and child health.

Half of the cases were considered mild by their parents, the study reported.

The results underscore the importance of creating policies that will result in early identification and intervention, the officials said.

The reports raise "a lot of questions about how we are preparing in terms of housing, employment, social support—all the issues that many of these people are going to need," said Dr. Tom Insel, director of the National Institute of Mental Health.

"It also raises questions about how well we're prepared in the educational system to provide for the special needs of many of these kids."

Insel said the federal government is beefing up the resources it is mobilizing to

address autism and related disorders, with \$85 million being appropriated by the National Institutes of Health and \$48 million for next year by the HRSA.

WPA PROGRAM

(Mr. KUCINICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KUCINICH. The recent economic report indicates that unemployment is approaching 10 percent. That means that close to 15 million Americans officially are out of work, but tens of millions more are underemployed. We have a Nation that is yearning for a major jobs program. We have to go beyond the weak stimulus that spent a hundred billion—seems like a lot of money—but \$100 billion for capital improvements, when the fact of the matter is we have close to \$3 trillion in infrastructure needs.

If we can match the unemployment in the country with infrastructure needs, we can go back to what FDR did in the 1930s, which is to create a new WPA that puts millions of Americans back to work, restoring our economy and giving people a chance to restore their own lives.

It's time for a new WPA program. Let's put America back to work. Let's address this unemployment crisis directly.

THE PROBLEM WITH WHITE HOUSE CZARS

(Mr. INGLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. INGLIS. Mr. Speaker, in my district, many people are telling me about their concern about the excessive use by the administration of special staff or czars. Over 30 czars are now serving in the Obama administration.

The problem we have with that is they haven't been confirmed by the Senate, and that is a real problem. If you exercise authority over American citizens, we need the constitutional protection of making sure that they've been vetted by the Senate and given approval by the Senate to serve in those capacities when they are exercising authority over the American people.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the excellent bill by our distinguished colleague from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON), the Czar Accountability Reform Act of 2009. It would cut off funding for these special assistants unless they have the consent of the Senate to serve, the approval of the Senate, the confirmation of the Senate to serve. That's what the Constitution requires, Mr. Speaker. That's what we need to require.

THINK PINK KIDS

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to two young and enterprising constituents from my district.

Two years ago, friends Max Woodrich and Doug Ellingson, decided to start a lawn mowing business, and their venture was unique in that they decided to use part of their profits to benefit breast cancer research.

Today, these 15-year-olds have had their idea turned into one of the most inspiring, philanthropic organizations in Minnesota's recent history. Think Pink Kids is now dedicated to providing education and awareness about breast cancer, constantly working to earn, raise, and donate money for research. They also have the goal of forming Think Pink Clubs in every school and civic organization in Minnesota.

One out of eight women will be diagnosed with breast cancer at some point in their lives, but thanks to the commitment of people like Doug and Max—and organizations like Think Pink Kids—the fight will continue until we ultimately defeat this terrible disease.

ST. MARY MERCY HOSPITAL

(Mr. MCCOTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCOTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to St. Mary Mercy Hospital in Livonia as they celebrate 50 years of serving the residents of southeastern Michigan.

The hospital opened its doors in 1959 with 170 beds, 99 physicians, and 300 employees. Today, the hospital includes the innovative "Our Lady of Hope Cancer Center," as well as a heart and vascular center, and an in-patient rehabilitation unit. An essential part of our community, St. Mary Mercy Livonia continues to provide superior comprehensive health care.

Indeed in 2007, St. Mary Mercy Livonia received the Health Grades Clinical Excellence Award for the third straight year. Last year, the hospital was named a "100 Top Hospital" by Thomson Healthcare thanks to St. Mary Mercy Livonia's doctors, nurses, and staff who devotedly work to help and heal patients and their families.

Mr. Speaker, St. Mary Mercy has served our community for over 50 years. I ask that we congratulate them on their devoted service in serving as a sanctuary for the sick and suffering of our community.

CZAR ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, article II, section 2, clause 2 of the United States Constitution says that the President must seek advice and consent from the U.S. Senate when ap-

pointing his principal officers. That's why it's so alarming that this President has appointed 36 czars, most without the consent of the U.S. Senate.

It let people like Van Jones—an admitted Communist who came up through a Marxist organization called STORM in Oakland, California—and puts him as a principal adviser of the President of the United States without the Senate having any say-so.

I've introduced the Czar Accountability Act. So far, this doesn't seem to bother one Democrat in the House of Representatives that the President seems to be sidestepping the Constitution. Maybe what should bother them is the fact that not one czar has come before the Appropriations Committee to justify and ask for his or her budget, yet these people make \$150,000, \$170,000 a year. Where is the Democrat Party? Does party come before constitutional duty?

You know, the Founding Fathers moved for balance of government and equal division, and that's what they had in mind.

□ 1930

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2647, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

From the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SKELTON, SPRATT, ORTIZ, TAYLOR, ABERCROMBIE, REYES, SNYDER, SMITH of Washington, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Messrs. MCINTYRE, BRADY of Pennsylvania, ANDREWS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Messrs. LANGEVIN, LARSEN of Washington, COOPER, MARSHALL, Ms. BORDALLO, Messrs. MCKEON, BARTLETT, THORNBERRY, JONES, AKIN, FORBES, MILLER of Florida, WILSON of South Carolina, LOBIONDO, BISHOP of Utah, TURNER and WITTMAN.

From the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, for consideration of matters within the jurisdiction of that committee under clause 11 of rule X: Messrs. REYES, SCHIFF and HOEKSTRA.

From the Committee on Education and Labor, for consideration of secs. 243, 551-553, 585, 2833 and 2834 of the House bill and secs. 531-534 and 3136 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ALTMIRE and Mrs. BIGGERT.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of secs. 247, 315 and 601 of the House bill and secs. 311, 601, 2835 and 3118 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. WAXMAN, MARKEY of Massachusetts and BARTON of Texas.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of secs. 812, 907, 912, 1011, 1013, 1046, 1201, 1211, 1213–1215, 1226, 1230A, 1231, 1236, 1239, 1240, Title XIII, secs. 1513, 1516, 1517, and 2903 of the House bill and secs. 1021, 1023, 1201–1203, 1205–1208, 1211–1214, Subtitle D of Title XII, Title XIII and sec. 1517 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BERMAN, ACKERMAN and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

From the Committee on Homeland Security, for consideration of sec. 1101 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

From the Committee on House Administration, for consideration of Subtitle H of Title V of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CAPUANO, GONZALEZ and DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.

From the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of secs. 583, 584, 1021 and 1604 of the House bill and secs. 821, 911, 1031, 1033, 1056, 1086 and Division E of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California and Mr. GOHMERT.

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of secs. 1091 and 2308 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. RAHALL, FALCOMA and HASTINGS of Washington.

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of secs. 321, 322, 326–329, 335, 537, 666, 814, 815, 834, 1101–1107, 1110–1113 and Title II of Division D of the House bill and secs. 323, 323A–323C, 814, 822, 824, 901, 911, 1056, 1086, 1101–1105 and 1162 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. TOWNS, LYNCH and FORTENBERRY.

From the Committee on Science and Technology, for consideration of secs. 248, 819, 836, and 911 of the House bill and secs. 801, 814, 833, 834, 912 and Division F of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. GORDON of Tennessee, WU and SMITH of Nebraska.

From the Committee on Small Business, for consideration of sec. 830 of the House bill and secs. 833, 834, 838, 1090 and Division F of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Messrs. NYE and GRAVES.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of secs. 315, 601 and 2811 of the House bill and secs. 311, 601, 933, 2835, 3301, 6002, 6007, 6008, 6012 and 6013 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. RICHARDSON and Mr. MICA.

From the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for consideration of secs. 525, 583, 584 and sec. 121 of Division D of the House bill and secs. 573–575, 617, 711,

Subtitle E of Title X, secs. 1084 and 1085 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. RODRIGUEZ, DONNELLY of Indiana and BUYER.

There was no objection.

NO FEDERAL FUNDS FOR CORPORATIONS CONVICTED OF FELONIES

(Ms. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, last week I introduced legislation to cut off Federal dollars to corporations that are convicted of felonies. Presently, corporate crooks are allowed to continue to receive taxpayer dollars, and that's wrong.

I urge my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to cosponsor H.R. 3679, the ACORN Act—the Against Corporations Organizing to Rip-off the Nation Act of 2009, and end waste, fraud, and abuse of billions of taxpayers' dollars.

Last month, Congress took action to defund nonprofits serving America, but it failed to act against the corporate crooks that are actually guilty of felonies—including defrauding taxpayers.

Why are companies that break the law as a business strategy allowed to receive taxpayer funds? A government contract is a privilege, not a right, and if a company commits a felony against the people of the United States, then that privilege must end.

It is time that Congress get serious and end taxpayer funding of corporate cheats, crooks, and criminals.

I urge support for H.R. 3679.

[From The Nation, Oct. 5, 2009]

AN ACORN AMENDMENT FOR PFIZER

(By Jeremy Scahill)

In the wake of the Congressional witch hunt against the community organization ACORN, initiated by Republican minority leader John Boehner and supported by all but seventy-five Democrats in the House and ten in the Senate (Independent Bernie Sanders also voted no), a small number of Democratic lawmakers are pushing back. Last week, in response to the Defund ACORN Act, which seeks to prohibit federal funds to the community group, Minnesota Democrat Betty McCollum, a member of the House Appropriations Committee, introduced an ACORN act of her own. It is titled the "Against Corporations Organizing to Rip-off the Nation Act of 2009," also referred to simply as the ACORN Act. HR 3679 seeks to "prohibit the Federal Government from awarding contracts, grants, or other agreements to, providing any other Federal funds to, or engaging in activities that promote certain corporations or companies guilty of certain felony convictions."

While some lawmakers are focused on exposing the hypocrisy of targeting ACORN and allowing the fraud- and abuse-plagued war industry to go untouched, McCollum's legislation takes aim at massive healthcare corporations. "It's time Congress get serious about taxpayer funding of corporate cheats, crooks and criminals," says McCollum. "Last month Congress took action to defund a nonprofit serving poor Americans but failed to act against the corporate crooks that are actually guilty of felonies—including

ing defrauding taxpayers. Why are companies that break the law as a business strategy allowed to receive taxpayer funds? A government contract is a privilege, not a right. If a company commits a felony against the people of the United States, then that privilege must end." Significantly, McCollum's co-sponsors on the legislation include Wisconsin Democrat David Obey, chair of the House Appropriations Committee. Obey was one of those 172 House Democrats who joined Republicans in voting to defund ACORN on September 17. McCollum, who voted against the Defund ACORN legislation, says that her own legislation is "modeled after" that one but "respects the Constitution by requiring a corporation to be guilty of a felony before federal funds are cut off."

McCollum's bill cites the 2008 Corporate Fraud Task Force Report to the President, which found that in fiscal year 2007, "United States Attorneys' offices opened 878 new criminal health care fraud investigations involving 1,548 potential defendants. Federal prosecutors had 1,612 health care fraud criminal investigations pending, involving 2,603 potential defendants, and filed criminal charges in 434 cases involving 786 defendants. A total of 560 defendants were convicted for health care fraud-related crimes during the year."

McCollum's bill singles out Pharmacia & Upjohn Company Inc., a subsidiary of Pfizer. Last month Pfizer agreed to pay a \$2.3 billion settlement, which the Justice Department calls "the largest healthcare fraud settlement in the history of the Department of Justice." The settlement stemmed from Pfizer's "illegal promotion of certain pharmaceutical products," where the company marketed dosages that had not been approved by the FDA. The company will also plead guilty to a felony violation of the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act for misbranding the anti-inflammatory drug Bextra "with the intent to defraud or mislead." Prosecutors allege that the company marketed "off label" uses of the drug, despite FDA bans. As the New York Times reported, "Pfizer instructed its sales representatives to tell doctors that the drug could be used to treat acute and surgical pain and at doses well above those approved, even though the drug's dangers—which included kidney, skin and heart risks—increased with the dose, the government charged. The drug was withdrawn in 2005 because of its risks to the heart and skin." Pharmacia & Upjohn will also pay a criminal fine of \$1.195 billion, "the largest criminal fine ever imposed in the United States for any matter," according to the DoJ. Federal prosecutors also stated:

Pfizer has agreed to pay \$1 billion to resolve allegations under the civil False Claims Act that the company illegally promoted four drugs—Bextra, Geodon, an antipsychotic drug; Zovox, an antibiotic; and Lyrica, an anti-epileptic drug—and caused false claims to be submitted to government health care programs for uses that were not medically accepted indications and therefore not covered by those programs. The civil settlement also resolves allegations that Pfizer paid kickbacks to health care providers to induce them to prescribe these, as well as other, drugs. The federal share of the civil settlement is \$668,514,830 and the state Medicaid share of the civil settlement is \$331,485,170. This is the largest civil fraud settlement in history against a pharmaceutical company.

On September 2, 2009, federal prosecutors, White House officials and military criminal investigators praised the settlement. "Pfizer violated the law over an extensive time period," said Mike Loucks, acting U.S. Attorney for the District of Massachusetts. He

added the fine against the company “demonstrates that such blatant and continued disregard of the law will not be tolerated.”

Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius called it a “historic settlement” and said the government is looking “for new ways to prevent fraud before it happens. Healthcare is too important to let a single dollar go to waste.”

Assistant Attorney General Tony West said, “Illegal conduct and fraud by pharmaceutical companies puts the public health at risk, corrupts medical decisions by healthcare providers and costs the government billions of dollars,” adding that the plea agreements “represent yet another example of what penalties will be faced when a pharmaceutical company puts profits ahead of patient welfare.”

Patrick McFarland, inspector general of the Office of Personnel Management, said the settlement “reminds the pharmaceutical industry that it must observe those standards and reflects the commitment of federal law enforcement organizations to pursue improper and illegal conduct that places healthcare consumers at risk.”

The head of the Defense Criminal Investigative Service said that Pfizer’s actions “significantly impacted the integrity of TRICARE, the Department of Defense’s healthcare system,” saying “This illegal activity increases patients’ costs, threatens their safety and negatively affects the delivery of healthcare services to the over 9 million military members, retirees and their families who rely on this system.”

Yet, despite all of these tough statements—and many more by top officials—Pfizer and its vast network of subsidiaries continue to win massive government contracts. Last year Pfizer made more than \$40 billion in profits, and in 2007 it had more than \$73 million in federal contracts.

Loucks points out that “at the very same time Pfizer was in our office negotiating and resolving the allegations of criminal conduct by its then newly acquired subsidiary, Warner-Lambert, Pfizer was itself in its other operations violating those very same laws.” In other words, the criminal conduct continues even as the company settles cases. “The CEO and Board of Directors should have been indicted,” wrote former New York City Mayor Ed Koch. “That is truly the only way to stop the practices which produce so much wealth for the company, its stockholders, officers and directors.”

The glaring question here is, Why is the “corporate felon” Pfizer still on the federal dole? ACORN, which received a total of \$53 million in federal funds over fifteen years, much of it going toward low-income housing initiatives, was singled out for a ban on funding over the actions of a handful of employees that were promptly fired. The fact is, Congress went after ACORN with a legislative nuke but, for years, has greeted Pfizer with welcoming arms and open wallets.

McCollum’s legislation states that no federal contract, grant or “any other form” of agreement “may be awarded to or entered into with the corporation or company for a 5-year period beginning 30 days after the date of the criminal conviction involved” and states that “no Federal funds in any other form may be provided to the corporation or company for such 5-year period.” The legislation also goes after criminal corporations’ ability to inject cash into the campaign coffers of politicians, prohibiting “corporate felons” from “contributing to a candidate for federal office, to a political party, or to a federal political action committee for five years.”

In 2008 Pfizer gave \$980,048 in campaign contributions to Democrats, representing 52 percent of its total campaign contributions.

It was the first year since 1990 that Pfizer gave more to Democrats than Republicans. The biggest recipients of Pfizer campaign dollars last year were Democratic Congressman Allen Boyd, who serves on the Appropriations Committee, and Democratic Senator Chris Dodd, a senior member of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee. In the 2010 cycle, the company has given 60 percent of its campaign cash to Democrats. Barack Obama blew out John McCain in contributions from the pharmaceutical industry, taking in some \$2.1 million compared to the \$668,000 contributed to McCain’s campaign.

McCollum’s legislation would limit the amount of lobbying expenditures by “corporate felons” to \$1 million a calendar year. In 2009 Pfizer has already spent \$11,720,000 on lobbying.

ACORN does not have high-powered lobbyists, and its 400,000 member families do not give major campaign contributions. If they did, the Defund Acorn bill would never have passed Congress. The question for those Democrats who voted to go after this community organization on dubious allegations is a simple one: will you apply that standard to actual corporate felons with real-life rap sheets whose actions have actually harmed ordinary Americans and ripped off taxpayers?

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2009, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

OLDER DRIVER AND PEDESTRIAN SAFETY AND ROADWAY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ALTMIRE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation that I have introduced that will help reduce the number of deaths and injuries occurring on our Nation’s roadways.

H.R. 3355, the Older Driver and Pedestrian Safety and Roadway Enhancement Act of 2009, authorizes \$500 million annually to be distributed to States from the existing highway trust fund to make our roads safer for older Americans. These funds can be used to make roadway improvements as described in the Federal Highway Administration’s Older Driver Handbook.

While older drivers have years of experience behind the wheel, they often require more time than younger drivers to react to changes on the road and are sometimes restricted in movement and cannot always meet the physical demands of turning to look at a blind spot or making sharp turns. According to the American Traffic Safety Services Association and the National Association of County Engineers’ “Low Cost Local Road Safety Solutions” publication, simple changes to signs and markings have a proven track record of being both affordable and extremely effective at reducing roadway deaths and injuries.

Some examples of these vital road safety improvements that would be funded by this legislation are signs with more legible font, retro-reflective sheeting and retro-reflective pavement markings, left turn lanes at intersections and improved sign placement to ensure that drivers have adequate time to make informed decisions on the road.

Last year, more than 37,000 men, women and children perished on America’s roadways. This bill will be an effective step forward in reducing this sobering statistic. According to the AARP’s Public Policy Institute, as of 2003, 80 percent of persons age 65 and older were licensed drivers, and 90 percent of all trips by older Americans are by automobile, whether as a driver or passenger. This is especially true in suburban and rural areas where mass transportation systems are limited or nonexistent. By 2020, one in five licensed drivers will be 65 years or older. By 2025, this number is expected to be one in four.

With Congress continuing to debate the next transportation authorization, it is important that we do not lose sight of the older citizens in our communities. By improving the safety of our roads and highways and making their daily travel as safe as possible, we increase road safety for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation that will improve road safety in every one of their districts. Please join me in raising awareness for road safety and the wellbeing of older and younger drivers alike by supporting H.R. 3355.

AMERICA FUNDING OFFSHORE DRILLING IN BRAZIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, just one short year ago, the ban was lifted for drilling for oil on the Outer Continental Shelf. We call that the OCS. And that was a good thing. We should be one year closer to all those high-paying jobs. We should be one year closer to that shot in the arm for the American economy. We should be one year closer to American energy independence. But we’re not.

Not by a long shot, because, you see, Mr. Speaker, the government still stonewalls offshore drilling. And that’s unfortunate for America. Between the OCS and oil shale resources, America could replace all of the oil Saudi Arabia sends us for the next 20 years. And that’s a lot of oil.

During that time, we could explore and develop other alternative energies to power our economy in the future. Also, by providing for our own energy with natural gas, solar, oil and nuclear, all of those issues are national security issues, so we won’t depend on foreign countries for our energy in the future.

Drilling off of our shore means jobs for Americans right now, real jobs, high-paying jobs, the kind of jobs that support whole families and pay to get kids into college. And it's not jobs on just oil platforms in the gulf. Think about all the other support industries, transportation, food, equipment, parts, insurers, construction and so. These real, high-dollar jobs would give a boost to our economy. These jobs are vital to America's families and to our economy, and it would keep American money in America. There's a real solution right in front of us for job and energy development.

But the government continues to move in the opposite direction. The cap-and-trade national energy tax, now called the climate change bill, will destroy the U.S. energy industry. Millions of jobs that go along with it will also be lost.

□ 1945

It is a national tax on energy consumption. Plus, it won't really help the climate. Instead of taxing energy, we should find more energy and encourage American energy development.

But we cannot drill off of our shores because I guess it will upset the blood pressure of the environmental elites. So, no new drilling.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do have breaking news. The administration does support offshore drilling. According to the Wall Street Journal, the government is loaning over \$2 billion in taxpayer money to a Brazilian company called Petrobras. Now, where did the United States, first of all, get that \$2 billion to loan to a foreign company? I thought we were broke. How come taxpayer money is going to a Brazilian oil company anyway? Why isn't that money staying here in America?

This Brazilian oil company is drilling off the shore of, not the United States, but Brazil. And are we getting that oil? Well, no, because China has a contract to purchase the hundreds of millions of barrels of oil those Brazilian oil fields will produce with taxpayer money. Isn't that lovely?

Let me explain it this way. Here is a chart. Right here this represents the United States. Of course we have these signs, no offshore drilling off the United States coast. We can't do that. But we are sending \$2 billion of American money down to a Brazilian oil company so they can, of course, drill off their shores. And is that money or oil coming back to us? I don't think so. That bag of money is going to China.

Now, this seems a bit strange to me. Why are American taxpayers footing the bill in Brazil without getting the oil or getting the money? Why aren't we expanding our own offshore drilling instead of sending American money to Brazil? Does anybody have the answer to that question? It seems like we should drill off our own coast, keep American money in America and take care of our own energy needs. We have millions of jobs just sitting there wait-

ing to be created off our shores. Drilling on the Outer Continental Shelf and extracting oil shale would provide the much-needed boost to the American economy. And we should stop funding oil-producing countries that support terrorism and the Middle East.

So what are we waiting for? If we would have started a year ago when the ban was lifted, our economy would be better than it is today. We would have had more jobs, jobs, jobs. It is way past the time for us to get started taking care of America. Don't drill in Brazil with American money. Don't take care of China. Drill American and take care of America.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

WHERE ARE THE JOBS?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I come from the great State of Michigan where we currently have the highest unemployment in the Nation and where our citizens have suffered more than most in this economic downturn. And every week when I come to Washington, I am constantly amazed that this Congress isn't laser focused on creating jobs, because the question being asked by the American people is: Where are the jobs?

When President Obama said he wanted an economic stimulus bill principally focused on tax cuts and infrastructure investment, I was all for it. But the bill that was passed by the Democrat majority in Congress really was unrecognized from what was originally proposed. That bill focused much more on expanding the size of government than expanding jobs in the private sector. Americans were told that if this huge expansion of government were passed, that 2 to 3 million new jobs would be created and unemployment would not reach 8 percent. And what are the results actually?

Well, since that time, our economy has shed nearly 3 million jobs and the unemployment rate has now reached nearly 10 percent. In my home State of Michigan, it is in the 15 percentile.

Nine months after the passage of the failed stimulus plan, Americans are still asking: Where are the jobs?

After passing a jobs bill that did not create jobs, House Democrats passed a cap-and-trade national energy tax. This national energy tax will destroy millions of jobs in this struggling economy. Manufacturing, which is so important in my home State of Michigan, would be especially hard hit when millions more good-paying jobs are shipped overseas to nations that are not going to put this jobs-killing tax on their manufacturing companies.

Struggling American families will also be very hard hit. The Obama administration's own estimates project that this legislation would cost our economy \$200 billion every year, which means an increase of \$1,700 for every American household. That means hard-pressed Americans are going to pay more for energy while at the same time having their jobs put at risk.

I would ask this, Mr. Speaker, as the American people continue to do: Where are the jobs?

Congress is now considering a health care reform bill that would amount to a government takeover and would be funded with job-killing tax increases and cuts to Medicare impacting the coverage of millions of American seniors. That bill, H.R. 3200, places an 8 percent tax on payroll for every business in this Nation that does not offer health care coverage to their workers.

Well, I have talked to countless employers, and they tell you that their costs run much higher than 8 percent, so they would end the private coverage that they currently give to their employees and dump them all out on the public plan.

Republicans have been accused of being the party of no because we have stood against this job-killing agenda, but we have offered alternatives, better alternatives, and it is actually the Democrats in Congress who have said no to these ideas. Let me cite a few specific examples.

We have offered an alternative to the stimulus plan that, according to the formula created by President Obama's own economic team, would create twice the jobs at half the cost. We have offered an all-of-the-above national energy plan as an alternative to the Democrats' national energy tax. Our plan would encourage the development of clean alternative energy while allowing the development of domestic supplies, which would bring energy costs down instead of driving them up. And it would create jobs here in America, and it would make America more energy independent.

We have offered commonsense approaches to health care reforms that would provide greater competition, increase access to care, and reduce costs. We feel that individuals should be able to purchase health care across State lines, and small businesses should be able to group together to open up more options and reduce costs to protect private health care. And we believe we need to enact real medical liability reform to end junk lawsuits that drive up

costs by forcing doctors to practice defensive medicine.

I raise these points because I truly believe we have to have bipartisan consensus to address the challenges that are facing our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are way ahead of the politicians here in Washington. They understand the need for jobs. They understand that bigger government will not increase jobs but will put millions more jobs at risk.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past the time we start listening to commonsense Americans who continue to ask: Where are the jobs?

CELEBRATING CHICAGO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, George Will once said, "Chicago Cub fans are 90 percent scar tissue."

So as we stand here 4 days after the city of Chicago, and all of the United States, were disappointed by the IOC's decision, I can assure you that there is no city better equipped to handle a little disappointment.

And despite the tremendous efforts of President and Mrs. Obama, Mayor Daley, Pat Ryan, and thousands of volunteers, that is exactly what we felt in my hometown last week: disappointment.

But the city of Chicago has already shaken it off and is waiting with open arms for the world to visit. Because as I have said before, Chicago was a world-class city before the Olympic decision and will be a world-class city tomorrow.

My hometown is often referred to as "The Second City," but most people don't realize that the nickname has nothing to do with our relationship to other cities. The name refers to a city which was rebuilt in the years following the Great Chicago Fire, a city where we pull ourselves up by our bootstraps, dust off our shoulders, and get back to work.

So with congratulations to Rio, I would like to offer a list of the top 10 reasons the world should stop by for a slice of deep dish in Chicago, the greatest city in the world.

Number ten: The architecture. One of Chicago's great residents, Daniel Burnham, was known for saying: "Make no little plans; they have no magic to stir men's blood." From the Louis Sullivan buildings downtown to Mies van der Rohe's collection at IIT to the neighborhood bungalows to the Sears Tower that scrapes the sky, Chicago's architecture is distinct and historic.

The schools. I am a proud graduate of Roosevelt University, the University of Chicago, and Loyola University, and had the honor of teaching young Chicagoans as well. Chicago is a place that inspires great ideas, but the Windy City is also a destination for the

world's greatest minds. Close to 90 Nobel laureates have passed through the halls of the University of Chicago and Northwestern University.

Green space. My district is home to one of the country's largest urban parks, Lincoln Park, which is also home to the oldest public zoo in the country, still free admission. Want to play 16-inch softball? We have 552 parks to choose from. No glove needed. And the forest preserve system is home to 68,000 acres of open space.

The lake. Chicago has one of the most beautiful shorelines in the world, 26 miles of lakefront with 15 miles of beaches. It is a front row seat to one of the largest freshwater sources in the world, and a reminder of our responsibility to conserve it.

The museums. The Art Institute of Chicago, just one of our museums, displays some of the most famous pieces of previous centuries and trains artists to produce the finest works of this century.

The arts. Chicago's music is played all around the world wherever people love the blues, gospel, jazz, or rock. And we are home to the preeminent Chicago Symphony Orchestra and the Lyric Opera. Most of the great comedians on Saturday Night Live and 30 Rock came through Chicago, home of The Second City troupe.

I guarantee you, Mr. Speaker, that no one in Copenhagen has ever had a proper hot dog or slice of pizza unless they have spent a little time in Chicago. From breakfast at Ann Sather's to chicken dinner at MacArthur's, to a midnight snack at the Wiener's Circle and all the pierogies, tacos, and steaks in between, it is the finest eating on Earth.

Sports. All of our teams are among the oldest in their leagues, and all of them played right in the city. They have all won championships. Some more recently than others, but everyone is entitled to a bad century.

Number two, the neighborhoods. Chicago has a beautiful downtown. Nothing is more majestic than coming northbound or southbound on Lake Shore Drive, but it is the diverse neighborhoods that make us world class. In one sense, the world doesn't need to come to Chicago; it already has. From Bowmanville to Bronzeville, Portage Park to Albany Park, Pilsen to Pullman, take the "L" around Chicago, and you have visited dozens of countries without ever leaving the city limits.

Finally, the number one reason the world should come to Chicago is the same reason I never left: the people. The Second City has always been second to none. Why? Because the people of Chicago look not at what we lost last week in Copenhagen but at what we now have the opportunity to accomplish. We know that our organizing efforts were not wasted. We can build better schools on safer streets. We can build better transit with greener technology. And beyond our bid plans lay big plans for our future.

In the words of Superdawg, one of Chicago's iconic hot dog stands, I look forward to welcoming you by saying, "Hiya, from the bottom of my pure beef heart."

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to coming back next summer with Chicago's Stanley Cup.

AARP: HELPING SENIORS OR HELPING ITSELF?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, when seniors across the country found out that the Medicare plan that was proposed by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle was going to cut Medicare and Medicare Advantage by \$500 billion over 10 years, they became very concerned, and they became very, very concerned about the organization called AARP supporting that plan that was going to make great cuts to seniors' medical coverage.

And so about 60,000 of those people said they were going to quit AARP because of AARP's endorsement of the very costly and benefit-cutting plan proposed by the Democrats. So AARP came out with this statement: "None of the health care proposals being considered by Congress would cut Medicare benefits or increase your out-of-pocket costs for Medicare services."

That's what AARP has been telling their seniors. But let me just read to you the facts from people who are working on the bills here in Washington, D.C., in the Congress.

The first one is the \$113 billion is a reduction in the extra benefits, the added, additional benefits that Medicare Advantage enrollees have available to them. That statement was made by a staff member of Senator BAUCUS's committee, the Finance Committee in the Senate. That contradicts what AARP said.

The Medicare Advantage cuts contained in the Democrats' health bills pending in Congress "could lead many plans to limit the benefits they offer, raise their premiums, or withdraw from the program." That statement was made by our Congressional Budget Office. Again, they refute what AARP said.

The next statement, "While these programs need to be made more efficient, if the proposed funding cut levels become law, millions of seniors and disabled individuals could lose many of the important benefits and services that Medicare Advantage health plans make so valuable." That statement was by Humana.

Humana is an organization that sells these plans, the Medicare Advantage plans, and they have been stopped because they told their enrollees what was going on with the Medicare Advantage cuts in the Democrats' proposals. As a matter of fact, late last month the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid

Services, CMS, directed Medicare Advantage plans to discontinue any communication with their enrollees about this thing that is taking place cutting their benefits.

□ 2000

This is absolutely terrible. There's no doubt that Medicare Advantage is going to be cut. The Republicans in the House have pointed out time and again that the Democrats' plan in this body will cut Medicare Advantage and other benefits of Medicare by over \$500 billion. In the Senate it runs anywhere from \$200 billion on up. We don't know how much because we've never even seen their final bill. It hadn't come out of committee, so we really don't know. But I can tell seniors this: They are going to lose benefits. They're going to lose Medicare Advantage. And so why is AARP saying that there's no change going to take place if we pass these plans?

It's because they have a benefit that they're going to get if Medicare Advantage is cut. And what is that benefit? They sell what's called Medigap, and Medigap coverage is more expensive than the Medicare plans we're talking about. And so they would get a tremendous kickback. Let me just tell you what it says here. There was an article written in Bloomberg, and the article said very clearly that the AARP is getting \$652 million a year in royalties and fees. That's an increase of 31 percent over last year when they got about \$500 billion.

And according to Bloomberg, the analysis published in December 2008, those royalties comprise 60.3 percent of what AARP gets. And if we do away, this body and the other body, does away with Medicare Advantage and seniors want more coverage, they're going to have to go to Medigap. That's sold by AARP, and AARP will be the beneficiary, and that's why 60,000 seniors have left AARP, because they don't want this to happen.

Let me just read to you what a couple of seniors said after they found out about this. One said, AARP has great buying power, and people should be able to get the best deal. What they're doing is unconscionable, what AARP has allowed to happen. Another disillusioned senior wrote to the organization's leadership and asked whether AARP had a special relationship with insurance carriers by which it receives commissions and kickbacks. And it does. Seniors need to know that Medicare and Medigap is going to take the place of Medicare Advantage. There's going to be big cuts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from South Carolina (Mr. ING-LIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. INGLIS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

THE SAGA OF THE MCKAY FAMILY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity of being here today. Hopefully I'll be here again tomorrow and the next day as well. And I do want to address an issue that is close to me as well as somewhat difficult. I admit that I have a romantic view of the world. Much of it is shaped by a lifetime having grown up watching television shows and movies. I like British mysteries and have enjoyed the fact that in Utah we have more of them available on PBS than they have back here in Washington. I think I've seen every episode of Law and Order and NCIS, and I grew up on Perry Mason which, once again, back home in Utah, there was a rerun every night on television at 10:30.

And I like those because in every sense of the word, each of these shows a good guy and a bad guy, and eventually the good guys were able to prevail against the bad guys. But I have to admit, much of that was the spin of Hollywood. So as I have looked in my life I try and see the world in maybe this dichotomy that's unfortunate, of good versus bad. To me the Drug Enforcement Agency, a part of the judicial system, Judiciary Department of the United States, were always the good guys. Their job was to try and take drug traffickers off the street, for indeed, those illegal drugs coming into our society harmed society. They harmed kids.

I had students I taught in school who I saw the byproduct of having them on illegal drugs. And I have seen the court system and been able to talk to those who work in the court system that recognize that even though the court case may be one of assault or one of burglary or vandalism, in each case there is often the core problem being illegal drugs.

Now, with that as a background, I want to introduce you to, today and tomorrow, a family in my hometown of Brigham City, the McKay family. I know this family primarily because of the four kids of the McKay family. I taught them all in school. Two boys and two girls, varying stages of academic ability, but in each case, I recognized within each of those kids there was a core quality. These were good, decent and honest kids. And I think my attitude towards the McKay family was shaped by the respect I have for the kids that came from that family.

Dr. McKay, in our community, has had a 30-year career as a respected board certified orthopedic surgeon. I guess the best compliment I can give is

that when my own kid broke his arm, we went to Dr. McKay to have it set and fixed. Dr. McKay is an Army veteran, serving 10 years in the military, retiring with the position of a lieutenant colonel. For 20 years he's been part of the Boxelder Search and Rescue Team. He was part of the Boxelder Medical Examiners team. The Boy Scouts of America have awarded him the Silver Beaver Award. When I was announcing football games at the local high school he was down on the field assisting with medical needs on a volunteer basis. He plays the organ in church.

I know that this family has supported me politically when I first ran. I hope it was because they saw something in me. My fear is that I was the first person from Brigham City city running for federal office, and therefore they were supportive. I also have worked with his wife in charities. This family has a criminal record that has nothing higher than parking tickets, and I have never thought of this family as a threat to my kids. But on June 5, 2008, there was a raid by the DEA on the home of the McKay family. Two weeks later, after this first 4-hour raid, there was another raid to find a copy of their will which, if they asked, they could have simply got. And in the fall of that same year another raid on his office with six armed agents asking for charts that they would have provided had they simply asked.

I was surprised when the first raid took place. But I decided I'll have to wait for a judgment because after all, the DEA are part of the good guys. Obviously, there has to be some kind of a reason. And in our system of justice, we are insured by the Constitution of a speedy trial and then a jury of the peers deciding guilt or innocence. At least that's what I used to teach my kids in civic classes. We are now in October 2009, 14 months later. I still do not know whether there is guilt or innocence in this situation because, in that entire period of time, there has not been a single charge filed against this family. However, the personal property of this family has been confiscated and not returned in that period of time.

At that June occurrence in 2008, there was a hard knock at the door. Dr. McKay said he was fearful at some particular time that had he not answered it quickly they may have kicked in the door. At that time he did open the door, and what happens in that, Mr. Speaker, is quite simply this: It is my intention of returning tomorrow and explaining what took place at that time and at that place, and to try and go on what has happened on this particular family, because it breaks my vision and my image of what the future should be. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time, and I hope to return tomorrow as I continue the saga of the McKay family.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PENCE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PENCE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GOHMERT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Florida addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

HEALTH CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to be here on the House floor this evening, joined by many of my colleagues representing the class of 2006, to come down to the floor this evening to talk to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle about an issue that doesn't discriminate between Republicans and Democrats, an issue that doesn't care whether you're liberal or conservative. It is the lack of access to affordable health care in this country. The voters of this Nation gave the House and the Senate and the President a mandate last November. It was to come here and do something that has not been done in the modern history of this government, to finally make fundamental reform of our health care system so that the people that we represent do not go bankrupt by the current system, and the government that we are constituted to protect doesn't go bankrupt because of health care costs.

So we're here to talk this evening about what we think is an amazing opportunity for this House and for this country to pass a health care reform bill that, at the same time, expands coverage to people that either don't have health care insurance or today have inadequate health care insurance and, in doing so, reduces the cost of health care for all Americans and all of

the countless businesses, small and large, that are struggling to pay for health care costs.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to turn this over to my colleagues to begin the discussion. But before we do, I just want to share one important chart and statistic with my colleagues. This is a chart that simply shows what has happened over the last 10 years to health care costs in this country, a 119 percent increase in the premiums that families and businesses are paying. During that same time, a 117 percent increase in the money coming out of workers' pockets to pay for that health care. A 119, 120 percent increase, let's round it off, in health care costs for businesses around this country.

That is unsustainable. And what it has meant is that during that time, any additional money that businesses have made over the last 10 years has largely gone not to workers' pockets, not to increased wages, but to pay health care bills. So we'll talk tonight about a lot of the visible costs of our very broken health care system, the scars on the outside that people have due to our neglect of the problems in our health care system.

But there are a lot of invisible costs as well. And what this chart very clearly shows is that when employers, over the last 10 years, are paying 120 percent increases, that means that a lot of workers out there aren't seeing raises, or are only seeing 2 percent when they should be getting 5 percent because their employer is sending all of that money into their insurance plan. And so we're going to talk about that tonight. We're going to frankly also talk about a lot of the mythology that's out there.

We had a speaker on the Republican side of the aisle earlier tonight come down here and use the now familiar Republican talking point of the government takeover of health care. Well, I think if any of our constituents out there do what every Member of Congress should do, which is read the bill, they'll find that there is no truth in that statement. That statement, though is anchored in a 28-page memo that made the rounds around the House of Representatives earlier this year by Frank Luntz, a very well known Republican pollster who laid out to Republicans how they could kill health care reform.

He said very clearly, don't pay attention to the details. Don't pay attention to the substance. Just say government takeover again and again and again. That memo is strewn with one piece of advice: If you say government takeover, you can stop health care reform from happening. And if you stop health care reform from happening, you can preserve the status quo.

That's what's happening here. Talking points and sound bites designed to stop health care reform from happening, designed to stop the reforms that will pass on lower costs to our constituents, that will guarantee ac-

cess to people that don't have it, that will end these discriminatory practices of insurance companies. That's the agenda that is going to play out on the House floor over the coming weeks and months, an agenda anchored in reform, anchored in cost-cutting, anchored in expanding our access and a political agenda designed to use talking points and sound bites to stop health care reform from happening.

I'm glad to be joined here on the House floor by several of my colleagues to talk about the stakes of this debate, to talk about what is really in the bill versus what folks are claiming is in there. And we have some great leaders in this effort joining us tonight, led by my good friend from Colorado, Representative PERLMUTTER.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. And I thank my friend, Mr. MURPHY, for kicking off tonight. And let's start where you were ending, about the status quo. Republicans in Congress just want to maintain the status quo. And I know in Colorado that's unacceptable, because what we've seen, like your chart, but even more so, the acceleration of the cost to keep people healthy and well is going through the roof. Whether it's a small business or a family, an individual, the premiums are going up. The deductibles are going up. I know at my old law firm, where it's in a position now where, after decades of providing coverage to everybody who works in the firm, there's a real question whether the firm can afford it anymore.

□ 2015

That's just not right—not in a country like our country. Not in America. We can do better than that. Change is what needs to take place. The status quo is no longer an option.

There's a fundamental flaw with the system that we have right now in that it allows discrimination against people who have prior health conditions. And that's just wrong. It's something that should not be allowed here in America.

I have a daughter with epilepsy. So, for me, it's a very personal kind of setting. She's a wonderful kid. She's no longer a kid. She's a young woman, college graduate, but still has seizures from time to time. She's not insurable unless she's in a big group insurance setting. She can't get insurance. She didn't ask to have epilepsy. But she's discriminated against because she has it.

That's just got to change. And I know in my district and in Colorado more than 80 percent of the people want to see change so that people with prior health conditions, preexisting conditions, get coverage and are not discriminated against.

We have a fundamental flaw in our health system today that has to be corrected. It's wrong. And it's probably unconstitutional under the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment to our Constitution. We've got to change that.

So we need to rein in costs for small businesses and for individuals. We need

to eliminate discrimination against people based on preexisting conditions. But there's a third component to this that I really think does offer hope and promise when we bring about this change and that is the research that we have going on in prevention, health and wellness.

There are some things coming down the pike if we continue to do research that will really advance medicine when it comes to cancer and heart disease which will help individuals and their quality of life and it will help this country rein in the costs that we see just growing every single day. This is a challenge that we must take, that we must tackle. We cannot shrink from it. America doesn't shrink from tough problems. We tackle them.

Our friends on the other side, the Republicans in Congress, they like to avoid this. They're not willing to take on tough issues. We are. We are going to take this on. We are going to change the health care system for the better of America and Americans. And we're going to do it this year.

With that, I yield to my good friend from New Hampshire (Mr. HODES).

Mr. HODES. Thank you.

I am glad to be with you tonight to talk about what is perhaps the most critical issue we face as a nation if we are to thrive, if our economy is to prosper again, and if we are to deliver to the American people, people of my State of New Hampshire, what they have been long asking for, which is real reform on health care.

We are going to lower costs for everybody, we're going to deliver better quality care, and we are going to put the people of this country back in control of their health care. Because right now, with all the noise that's been out there—and you've referenced the notion that's been put forward of a government takeover of health care. Well, nothing could be further from the truth. But at the moment what is between us and our health care are insurance company bureaucrats who are making life-and-death decisions and are able to discriminate against the American people based on profits for the insurance companies. That simply has to end.

I'm going to tell you a story. It's a story of how change happens. It's a story of tragedy and it's a story, ultimately, of triumph. But it talks to the issue of what kind of situation we're in with our insurance companies.

In my district in New Hampshire at Plymouth State College there was a young woman named Michelle Morse. She was in her senior year. Beautiful young lady, 3.6 grade average, an honor student. She was looking forward to graduating at the end of her senior year and moving on with a happy life.

She woke up one day with a stomach-ache. By the next morning, she was diagnosed with cancer—serious, aggressive, fast-moving cancer. And her doctors said to her, You've got to leave school and take a leave of absence in order to get treated for your cancer.

And so she and her family—because she was on her family's insurance policy—went to their agent. They called their insurance company and they explained the situation and they said Michelle has to leave school to get treated for cancer.

What came back from the insurance company was, Well, that's up to you. That's fine. If Michelle needs to leave school, she leaves school. Let her take a leave of absence. But if she's not a full-time student, if she takes a leave of absence, she will no longer be covered by your insurance.

The Morse family couldn't believe it. But, sure enough, buried in the print of that insurance policy was exactly that—unless Michelle was a full-time student, she wouldn't be covered.

So they made the difficult decision. Michelle stayed in school. She took three courses of chemotherapy. She finished with honors—an incredible achievement. And sadly, Michelle died.

Now her mother, Ann Marie Morse, is a teacher. She's a teacher that teaches elementary school kids. She had never been involved in politics a day in her life. But she decided that what happened to her daughter, what happened to her family, was wrong. She decided that she would make it her business to make sure that what happened would never happen to another family again.

Now this is just a very small slice of the larger debate about health care; a very small piece of what it takes.

So first, Ann Marie Morse, a teacher, went and lobbied everybody in Concord, New Hampshire, the capital of New Hampshire and got a State law passed, thanks to her efforts, that said college students can take a 1-year leave of absence without getting knocked off their parents' insurance policies. But that wasn't enough because it's Federal law that controls. ERISA controlled. And ERISA needed to be amended.

So I worked with Ann Marie Morse. We worked here in Congress on a bipartisan basis. We got every health insurance association, we got everybody involved, because even the health insurance companies knew that what happened to Michelle Morse was wrong and it shouldn't be allowed to happen. Even the insurance companies knew that.

So with Ann Marie Morse in the gallery of this House, the House by unanimous vote passed Michelle's Law to allow college students to take a 1-year leave of absence for serious medical conditions without getting knocked off their insurance. Because the Morse family had nowhere to go because now Michelle couldn't find other insurance. She had a preexisting condition. And they couldn't afford private insurance—single, private, individual insurance—because it was just priced too far out of the market because the insurance companies had a monopoly. There was nowhere to go. She couldn't get Medicaid. She couldn't get Medicare. She couldn't find any alternative. She had to stay in school.

So when the House passed it, then the Senate passed the bill. President Bush signed it into law. And this Friday, October 9, Michelle's Law becomes the law of the land. So that what happened to Michelle Morse will never again happen to any college student in this country.

Thousands, thousands of college students are affected. MIKE CASTLE on the other side of the aisle was the cosponsor. He understood. A responsible Republican understood that what was wrong shouldn't happen again. So he worked on the law because he had somebody in his district who it happened to. I'm betting if we all look, all my colleagues who are here tonight, we'd find people in our districts, other people that this has happened to.

It took 2 years to get that done, this small slice of the health care problem. Two years. And now we face a bigger test. Are we going to hold the insurance companies responsible for reasonable action on the part of the insurance companies?

The insurance companies now are regulated by a patchwork of 50 different State rules and regulations. Fifty different schemes for regulating. We are talking about, finally, for the first time, saying to the insurance companies, as the people of the United States of America, No discrimination for preexisting conditions like diabetes or heart condition or cancer, no dropping your coverage because you become sick—both of the things that happened to Michelle Morse, which Michelle's Law is designed to affect for that small slice of college kids.

No refusal to renew your coverage if you paid in full and become ill. No more job or life decisions made based on loss of coverage. No need to change doctors or plans if you like the coverage you have. No copays for preventive and wellness care. No excessive out-of-pocket expenses, deductibles, or copays. Yearly caps on what you pay, but no yearly or lifetime cost caps on what insurance companies cover.

These are reasonable rules that we are finally going to set down on the insurance companies. Reasonable rules. The kind of rules of the road that the American people deserve and that our health care reform plan is going to deliver so that what happened to Michelle Morse will never happen to any family or anybody, whether they're in or out of college. It's time for real reform.

With that, I'm going to turn it over to my colleague, JOHN SARBANES of Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Thank you very much. I appreciate it. I want to thank Congressman MURPHY for bringing us here tonight to talk about this very, very important issue.

I just had a couple of things I wanted to talk about. First of all, we're bringing this thing across the finish line very soon. I know a lot of folks are excited about that. But I want to make sure people understand we are not

limping across the finish line. We're going to cross that finish line with a burst of energy that comes from understanding that we have finally addressed so many of the grievances that millions of Americans have had with this health care system for so many years.

There are a lot of things we can talk about that are wrong with the existing system. And it's important to point those out. But we need to spend just as much time about the good things that are going to happen if we can get this health care reform passed.

There's so much in all of the core components of the health reform legislation that has come out of all the different committees, both in the Senate and the House—there's so much in there that addresses these concerns people have had for so long.

I want to talk a little bit for a moment about the Medicare portions of this bill, because the other side has presented a very sort of cynical scenario about what is going to happen to the Medicare program under this bill.

In fact, every effort that we've made in shaping these bills when it comes to Medicare has been to strengthen the program, to make sure that the Medicare trust fund lasts longer, to make sure that we're looking after seniors, as we should, and protecting their interests. So let me talk a little bit about that.

We are going to parts of the Medicare program where we can find responsible savings—and I'll be more detailed about that in a moment—but just conceptually understand that those savings are then being turned around and reinvested back into the Medicare program.

So, in other words, this is not a case of finding savings that go someplace else. The savings that we're looking to get out of the Medicare program from a more responsible approach is going to be taken and turned right back into an investment in the Medicare program.

So where are we getting some of the savings? Well, there's something called preventable readmissions to a hospital. This is a situation where somebody is discharged from the hospital too quickly. Often this occurs because the insurance companies, who don't want to pay to keep people in the hospital because they're trying to keep their costs down so they can pocket more of the profits that they get from your premium dollar, they push people out of the door too quickly. Well, that means folks are leaving the hospital before their situation has been completely stabilized or addressed—with what consequence? The consequence that a few days later, a week later, 2 weeks later, suddenly they've got complications. They've got to come back into the hospital. That's not good for them, but it also costs the system a lot of money.

The estimates are that you can save billions of dollars if you insist on better thinking at the point of discharge, so that when people leave the hospital, it's time for them really to leave the

hospital and their situation has been addressed so they're not going to have to be readmitted a few days later. We're taking those savings and we're reinvesting them in the program.

□ 2030

You all remember the stories we used to hear about years ago about the \$600 toilet seat that the Pentagon used to purchase as an example of wasteful spending. Well, there was just an article the other day in the newspaper about a company that makes motorized wheelchairs. It costs them about \$1,000 per wheelchair to make this. They've been turning around and selling it to the Medicare program for \$4,000. A 400 percent markup.

Well, that's wasteful. We can rein that spending in. We can take the savings, and we can plow it into things that make sense for the Medicare program. What are some of those reinvestments that are important? Number one, we are going to make sure that physicians get reimbursed at the level they should. Many seniors I have talked to have expressed alarm because either they or people they know have talked to physicians who say, We can't afford to stay in the Medicare program any more. We're going to opt out.

Well, when President Obama came in, he said, We're not going to play games any more with physician reimbursement. We're going to reimburse them fairly. And this bill does that. This bill makes sure that a cut of up to 20 percent that was supposed to occur, with respect to physician reimbursement, that's not going to happen. It will keep more doctors in the network. That is going to be better for our seniors.

Another place we are reinvesting the savings is to begin closing the doughnut hole in the part D prescription drug program, which has really hit many seniors between the eyes when they have to come out of pocket to cover their prescription drug costs. We are going to begin to phase in filling in that doughnut hole so that coverage is there, another benefit of finding savings in one place and reinvesting it in another.

The last thing that I mentioned that is very important is we recognize that there are certain preventive kinds of services that make absolute sense, and we don't think that seniors should have to have copayment related to those services anymore.

So what's an example? The initial exam. Under the new bill, no longer will there be a copayment requirement. You don't have to come out of pocket for that service. Glaucoma screening, no longer will there be a copayment requirement, and other services like this that make sense because they save the system money overall, and they are good for the individual patient.

There is so much about this bill that makes sense. There is so much that we fashioned based on the recommendations of experts and ordinary citizens who came forward and said, We need to

see a change. That's what we've done. We've answered that call. I am very excited about the prospects of crossing the finish line with that burst of energy that says, We have accomplished something that the American people sent us to do. That's what we are going to be doing over the next few weeks.

I really appreciate the opportunity to speak here this evening, and I now yield to my colleague from Vermont, PETER WELCH.

Mr. WELCH. Thank you very much. It's a pleasure to be here. It's an incredible debate that we have. It's long overdue. We have to have affordable, accessible health care for all our citizens, and we have to have it be affordable for our employers and our taxpayers. We don't have that now. You know, right now in 2009, health care spending eats up about 19 percent of every family's income. Under present trends, that would go up to 31 percent in 2019, and anybody who is working for a paycheck, a wage or a salary, has faced over and over again year in and year out that grim choice of accepting a very small raise—if they're lucky enough to get a raise—in exchange for hanging onto the health care benefits that they have.

So the real challenge of health care is to make it affordable and accessible for the people who have it, but for whom the quality of health care and the cost of health care is slipping beyond their reach.

Now, there are three elements to the health care bill: one is insurance reform, two is extension of coverage to the uninsured, and three is a public option. As my friend from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) mentioned, insurance reform is overdue. The insurance companies make their money, and a lot of it, not by paying claims, but oftentimes by rejecting claims. Not by covering everyone who needs coverage, like my friend from Colorado's daughter who has a preexisting condition, but by writing policies to exclude folks who have a preexisting condition or illness or by refusing to continue insurance for somebody that was covered but gets sick and then needs it.

You can't have a health insurance system that operates that way because at some point each and every one of us is going to need health care coverage. And if health care insurance companies that are supposedly getting paid to provide coverage reject us when we need it so they can pad their bottom line, it's good for them, but it's not sustainable for us.

So health insurance reforms are immensely important. Anybody who has had to use their health care coverage has probably run into the hassles that they've had to deal with, with the pages and pages of billing, with the disputes about whether a particular service is or is not provided, even though it was recommended by your physician; and anybody who's talked to their own physician about the frustrations in that office, all the back-office personnel that they have to have just to

process these claims, knows that it's a nightmare of confusion, incredible inefficiency and very, very expensive.

Now, the sad truth is that this system is as inefficient and frustrating for doctors as it is frustrating for fathers, mothers and families. It works great for the insurance companies. What we've seen with insurance companies is that they're making a lot of money. The head of Aetna one year made \$24 million in 1 year. And for what? It's to process claims. The work is done by the medical providers, by the nurses, by the hospitals; and the insurance companies are processing claims. It's something that needs to be done.

But \$24 million for the head of the company, where much of what they're doing is slicing and dicing who they'll insure in order to boost up those profits? We've got to change that. We have got to have a system where your health care dollar is paying for your health care needs, not for the \$24 million salary of the head of Aetna.

You know, even in my own State of Vermont, which is very small, and we don't have these huge executive salaries, by and large, the head of Blue Cross/Blue Shield, who was there for 9 years, when he walked out the door, he left with \$9 million. That's unbelievable in Vermont.

Our farmers are struggling to hang onto a way of life, our workers are working a second and third job to try to make ends meet. When they have to use health care, the can't afford the copay and deductible. Oftentimes they are pulling back from getting the care they need.

So one of the major elements of this health care reform is really cracking down on insurance company practices that, yes, work fine for them but are digging a deep hole for the American economy, families, and businesses. Health care reform is going to require that all insurers compete on a level playing field, that they offer policies regardless of preexisting condition, that they don't have a lifetime cap on what your benefits are if you get an illness that requires significant care, that they can't yank your insurance because you need it.

Then you're going to have insurance companies competing for your business on the basis of the service and the value, not on the basis of how cleverly they can write their policies to surprise you when you think you're going to get it. So insurance reform is a major component. Second is extending coverage to the uninsured. More and more folks are becoming uninsured. Obviously, if we can extend affordable coverage to them, it's very good for them. But, Mr. Speaker, it's very good for any of us who have coverage because it means about an \$1,100 savings for each and every one of us.

Finally, is the public option. There has been a lot of debate about that, but what it's about very simply is extending choice to you and me so that if we want to select a public option insur-

ance program that competes on a level playing field with the private insurance companies, we can. It also is not a cram-down for our providers. Our doctors, our hospitals, our medical care folks, they can decide yes or no to be in that public option. So this is a choice. It's adding a choice for us. It's adding a choice for our medical providers, and it's going to create some competition for the insurance companies who, in all candor, have been running roughshod over the American consumer and our small businesses for years.

So I thank my friend from Connecticut for bringing us together, and I yield back to you.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank my friend from Vermont. He talks about the public option. It gets a lot of attention out there. A lot of rhetoric gets thrown back and forth on the news networks at night, the cable TV shows, and right here about the public option. I think President Obama, in his speech before this Chamber, said it right: this isn't about ideology. A public option isn't about a liberal philosophy versus a conservative philosophy. The public option represents our best chance to start holding private insurers accountable and putting some real downward pressure on premiums. That's what we're all about. I mean, there should be total bipartisan agreement on that basic premise, that health care reform should be about bringing down the cost of premiums for all of our constituents.

Now, maybe there are a few people here who are so in bed with the health care industry that they like the fact that patients and consumers are paying through the roof for health care insurance and drugs and devices. But I think for most of us on both sides of the aisle we want to get to lower premiums, and what President Obama said, which I think laid it out pretty clearly, he said, I am for a public option because it's the best chance we have to put some pressure on the private insurers to bring costs down. But he said, if you can find me something else that does that, I am for that too or I'm for that instead. I agree.

I'm not for the public option because I think that the government has to have an insurance plan that's available to individuals because that is a baseline of my political ideology. I'm for it because that's the best way to bring down cost. And that's not just me saying that. That's the Congressional Budget Office. The Congressional Budget Office, when analyzing the House and Senate bills, says that having the choice of a public option in that exchange that any small business or individual could choose is a real pressure point as a nonprofit plan that doesn't have to pay marketing costs, advertising costs, big CEO salaries and doesn't have to make a return on its investment.

A nonprofit plan will reduce the cost of the bill and reduce the cost to our health care system by \$100 billion. The

whole bill together every year costs about \$100 billion. So the public option alone essentially brings down the cost of the bill by the equivalent of 1 year of health care reform. So I think that if our friends on the Republican side of the aisle want to say "no" to the public option, well, that's their right to do so. But I think that they should come to the table with an alternative to try to deliver some cost savings to our constituents.

Now, maybe I oversimplify things when I say that this is about reform versus no reform. I'm sure there are people on the other side of the aisle that want to do something. But we have yet to see a reform plan from the Republicans that can prove to us that they're going to be able to lower costs for our constituents. I think once they do that, Mr. PERLMUTTER, we can have a real debate.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank my friend from Connecticut. Let's talk about why this works, why this concept works. You have millions of people out there, small businesses and individuals, who can't get insurance today. It's just too costly. They don't create a big enough pool. The actuaries say this doesn't work. You put them in one big pool like the Federal Government, like State governments, like Boeing, like some big company that can go to insurance companies, go to other types of mechanisms and really drive down the cost per employee or the like.

So we create a marketplace. We call it an exchange in this bill, but there is a marketplace for small businesses and individuals to go to. They're going to be able to select from private insurance companies, Blue Cross/Blue Shield, Aetna, CIGNA, United Health and the like; but there will also be another choice, another option which is being called the public option, but it gives another choice for consumers, another choice for small business, another choice for individuals.

Because there are now millions of people in the pool, it's going to be something that many companies would like to have. They would like to be able to attract those kinds of customers, get new paying individuals into their pool. We think that that's going to drive down prices, or at least contain the costs that all of us have seen go up and up and up. So I think that there is a real opportunity for us, both in terms of cost to the public as well as cost to private business, to really rein in these costs and make sure all Americans are covered by insurance in case something bad happens, but also make it so it's affordable for each and every one of us.

With that, I will yield to my friend from New Hampshire because he looks like he has something he wants to add.

Mr. HODES. I think it's a very important discussion because really what we're talking about, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, is consumer choice. It is a hallowed principle here in this country. The American consumers

want choice. And what we are doing here with the House bill is really designing a uniquely American system that delivers more choice, more competitiveness, and more control for consumers of health care. It's especially important in my State of New Hampshire because in New Hampshire, small business is big business. Some 65 percent of people in New Hampshire are employed by small businesses.

What has happened in small business on the health care front is a lot worse. As bad as it is for many individuals and big businesses, for small businesses, it's a lot worse. In the same time that individual premiums have gone up 100 percent or 117 percent, for small businesses in this country premiums are up 129 percent. Since the early 1990s when 68 percent of small businesses offered health care, we are now seeing that drop off; whereas today it's about 38 percent of small businesses who are able to offer health care to their employees because the costs are simply too high. There is not enough choice in the marketplace.

□ 2045

So what we are doing is what many of us talked about to our constituents, which is saying we think that you folks ought to have the same kind of choices that we have as Members of Congress. If an exchange, the choice, is good enough for us, it ought to be good enough for you. And what the exchange does is finally deliver stability and security and choice. Stability, security, and choice.

It's the security of knowing that if a small business can't find private insurance that they like—and, by the way, what's really critical to say is if people like their insurance, there is nothing in this bill, nothing that says you've got to give up your insurance. You keep your insurance if you like it. But if you don't, you have the option. You have a choice and the security of knowing that there is a consumer choice provision. It's called public option, consumer choice, available to you that will insure you on a level playing field with competitive provisions and competitive costs that means you will be able to find insurance. That's what is critical.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Reclaiming my time, I think we need to get at where the Republicans are coming from here because a lot of them just hate the public option. They hate it because apparently government-run medicine, a government-administered plan, shouldn't be an option for our constituents. They just do not want people out there to have the choice of a publicly sponsored plan. But then when you ask them whether it's still good enough for people that are 65 or older, no, Medicare is fine. We like Medicare. Well, how about is it good enough for our soldiers who are fighting for us overseas? No, it's good enough for our soldiers. What about for our veterans? No, government-spon-

sored medicine's good enough for our veterans. What about for Members of Congress? Well, yes, I want it for Members of Congress.

Well, publicly sponsored insurance is good enough for seniors. It's good enough for veterans. It's good enough for soldiers. It's good enough for public employees, for Members of Congress. All we want is for our constituents to have the ability to decide whether it's good enough for them, too. That's the choice that you're talking about, Mr. HODES.

Mr. HODES. Thank you. And that's exactly the point. We are simply saying that it's time for everybody in this country to have real choice in their health care because I trust the people of this country to make good choices when they have the choices to make. And I find it somewhat surprising that my colleagues in this Chamber, most of them across the aisle, say it's good enough for me, but what I've got, oh, no, you don't need it, you don't want it. Let's just leave it all to the private insurance companies. Let's just leave it all there.

I don't know what's going on with that, but I would think certainly choice is the right way to go. And I can't imagine any constituent, any person we represent, wouldn't want more choice in their health care because we thrive on choice, and our competitive system in this country, our economy thrives on competition. So having it out there where private insurance companies, now there are some real rules. Folks, you're going to have to compete on a level playing field with the people of this country. Here's our choice, and the people of the country get to make the choice.

I think it's a really important statement that we are making in terms of trusting the American people to make the right choices if they have the right choices, and it's high time that we gave it to them.

Mr. WELCH. If the gentleman will yield, one of the things that I hear from a lot of Vermonters is that they're frustrated that in Vermont there are only two or three insurance plans that they can choose from. And a lot of times people say what they'd like to do is buy, or have the opportunity to buy insurance from out of State. And the reason that many States don't do that is that the private insurance companies, including some so-called non-profits, by and large dominate their local market areas. So the frustration that many Vermonters have, very limited choice about what insurance they can buy, that's a frustration folks have in Texas, in Colorado, in New Hampshire, in Connecticut, all over the country.

Now, we regulate insurance with a set of rules that levels the playing field that applies to them and to the public option. So when you as a consumer purchase a policy, you can have some confidence that you actually are going to get coverage for your wife, for your

daughter, for your husband. Then that will create the circumstances where we will have competition. And you know what? The insurance companies don't like competition, and they have been very good at restricting it. And then when you deny that choice and you deny competition, the prices, in fact, do go up. The market power of the insurance companies to boost prices, the pharmaceutical companies to boost prices beyond what the competition would allow if there were a freer market is costing the American people an awful lot of money.

So we add a level playing field, a new choice of a public option that's the choice of you from Colorado, me from Vermont. It's going to create competition that is, as many people know from their own experience, going to drive down costs and we hope improve quality, Mr. PERLMUTTER.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I appreciate my friend from Vermont.

I think within the system, the insurance companies have done what they are supposed to do. They're supposed to maximize profits for their shareholders. So I don't blame them. I think that we need to change the system, and that's what we're doing. And I guess I have confidence in them to really deliver health care insurance and coverage to people at a much more affordable level. I think they're going to be able to compete just fine. The system right now doesn't really mandate that or require that of anybody.

So we have got to take a look at a whole variety of these insurance reforms so that everyday Americans aren't placed into having to go to the emergency room as their first place of care. I mean, if you want to talk about the most expensive way to deliver health care to Americans across our Nation, it's if they have to go to the emergency room instead of to their doctor or instead of to the local clinic. To go to the emergency room drives up prices like crazy. That's got to stop, and that's what we're going to change. That's the reason we are willing to tackle a very tough subject.

The last time America and Congress really addressed the health care system in this country was 44 years ago in 1965 with the Older Americans Act. This is not easy to deal with this. A lot of people have different opinions. The health care system touches each and every one of us. But we are not going to shrink from this. We have to tackle it, and we are. We're going to tackle it in a way that it improves the system and improves the lives of everybody across the country.

And my friend from Connecticut, I would like to say that we have most of New England represented here with Vermont and New Hampshire and Connecticut, and the New England Patriots are playing the Broncos on Sunday, and I'd wager, although that's probably something I shouldn't do on the floor of the House, but my guess is my Broncos are going to defeat your New England Patriots.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Mr. PERLMUTTER, I don't really care. I'm a New York Giants fan. So you can have that bet with somebody else. But I like the fact that you just lump all of us New Englanders all in together that we believe and think the same things. We're diverse, despite what you may think.

Mr. PERLMUTTER, let me back you up on your discussion on what insurance companies are doing now. You're right. Insurance companies are playing by the rules today, and they've got shareholders, they've got investors. In the end, they've got to put a return out there for the people that are investing in their companies. That's why they call the money they spend on health care "medical loss," because to them, as a business, that's a loss. Now, that doesn't mean that these are bad people that are running the business. It doesn't mean that they don't want to keep people healthy. But in the end, every dollar they spend on health care is less money that they can return to their shareholders.

So to try to gain a competitive advantage against each other, they engage in these practices, like keeping out people that are sick and charging more for people in their plans when they get sick, rescinding policies when you get sick because you didn't cross your "T" or dot your "I."

But, frankly, Mr. PERLMUTTER, a lot of the insurance companies that are part of the health care reform debate don't really have a problem with the rules changing with respect to pre-existing conditions and rescission, because as long as they apply to everybody, as long as none of their competitors can get an advantage over the other by excluding sick people or charging more for sick people, then they're okay, as long as everybody's doing the right thing.

Frankly, that's why it's bewildering to me that we are still sitting here today having not done this 10 years ago, 20 years ago. And it's why I doubt some of my Republican friends who all of a sudden are for these reforms, because they had 12 years when they controlled the House. They could have done it during any of that time.

So I think there are clearly places, as Mr. WELCH outlined, where we are going to depart from the insurance companies. They don't want this competition from the public option. They don't want to have that pressure for their costs to come down. But I think there are going to be some places where we can get some agreement here. And my hope is that as we try to get to the finish line, that we set the lines in the sand where we're not going to be able to compromise with the health insurance company, with the drug industry, but we also understand there are going to be some places that we can come together here on, Mr. HODES.

Mr. HODES. Thank you. I want to speak to the importance of finding common ground if we can find it, be-

cause health care is not a partisan issue as far as I'm concerned and I think most of us are concerned. Democrats need doctors and hospitals. Republicans need doctors and hospitals. Independents need doctors and hospitals. We are all in this health care system together. And I would hope that my colleagues on the other side can begin to put aside the name calling and fear tactics that have characterized so much of the debate and speak directly to the real needs of the American people for a system that delivers stability and security, that delivers real choice in health care, that keeps the good that we have in the system because we have terrific hospitals and terrific doctors who are laboring under real impediments to delivering high-quality care.

If you think about what the typical doctor has to go through to fill out the forms for the insurance companies, and the stories that I have heard from my physicians in New Hampshire about the advocacy and fighting that they have to do just to deliver basic health care to their patients because of all the forms and the paperwork and the bureaucracy and administrative costs that go into it, you begin to get a picture of why costs are going up so high and what we have to do for our doctors to help them deliver better care.

One of the things that we haven't talked about in the bill is an important investment in cost-saving measures like medical information technology. Currently, many of our doctors, most of our doctors and hospitals, are dealing with paper records. They're dealing with paper records and there is not a coordination of records. It has led to less quality of care than we could have. And what we are going to do in this bill is make significant investments in information technology that help all our doctors and our hospitals deliver better care.

Now, my mom is 83 years old. The last time I talked to her, she was up to about six different doctors for her various needs and ailments. As far as I can tell, she has to walk from office to office carrying her records and her x rays and her pills in bags under her arm, trying to tell one doctor what the other doctor said or did, and you can see in there the kind of problems that our current system has.

We have the ability to make an investment in medical records technology, which is going to deliver better care for everybody. It's an important part of the bill, and it's one of the things that has to happen to bring our system into the 21st century.

We're going to protect privacy. We're going to preserve patient confidentiality. But we are going to make the necessary investments to bring the medical records technology into a place where we reduce medical errors, which reduces costs for everybody and improves the quality of care throughout our system. It's a very important component of this bill. And I can't

begin to think that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would object to making that kind of investment, because in the end, when we invest in health care reform and health insurance reform, two different things, by the way, when we invest in health care reform and health insurance reform, we save billions and billions and billions of dollars over time because the system, as it is, is unsustainable.

There are investments we have to make to make sure that our economy thrives and that we deliver choice, we deliver better care and better quality, and we put the American people in control of their own health care with a stable and secure system. That means they can't get thrown off their insurance. They'll have access to the medical care they need when they need it. It will be portable and affordable. And those are the hallmarks of a system that will help this country's economy thrive and, I dare say, is perhaps the single biggest economic boon we can deliver to businesses large and small, reduce our deficit, and keep us competitive in the global economy.

□ 2100

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank you, Mr. HODES.

And just for me, I would like to wrap up this way: that this is a system where there are parts that are broken, there are parts that are working, and there are parts that haven't been addressed in a long time. We're going to fix what's broken, we're going to keep—and to the degree we can—improve what's been working, and we're going to work on ways to make Americans or help Americans be healthier and to have research that directs them towards better cures and prevention of very difficult illnesses, whether it's heart disease or cancer.

This is a tough subject that we have tackled, but we're not going to shy away from it. We can't. Change is what has been demanded of us. The system requires change. The status quo is not an option. We will tackle this, and we will make this better, and we're going to do it right now. There is no more time to waste—as much as our friends on the Republican side of the aisle would like to just avoid this at all costs. The trouble is it's costing America too much, and we will take it on.

With that, to my friend in Connecticut to wrap it up.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you.

Thank you to Mr. HODES, Mr. WELCH for joining us down here for this hour.

Listen, I think we have heard loud and clear from the businesses we represent, from individuals, from doctors, from hospitals: Things need to change.

Just take this one last statistic home with you. If we do nothing, if we allow the status quo to continue, within 30 years health care costs will consume almost half of every dollar spent in this country—every dollar that businesses are spending and individuals are

spending and the government is spending. That is ruinous for this Nation. That course cannot stand.

So I hope that as we debate this over the coming weeks and coming months that we can have some coming together here, we can agree on the bottom lines of health care reform, get coverage to people who don't have it, and lower costs to everybody. And we will shut out the people who scream government takeovers and death panels and all of the rest. All of the people either inside this building or outside this building whose agenda is to either stop health care from happening or to score political points shouldn't have a place at the table. But anyone who wants to have an honest debate about how we make the system work better for people we represent I think should be there. I think that's something we can all come together on.

I thank my colleagues for joining us this evening. We will be back as much as we can.

ACORN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, for about the last 3 to 5 months I have been down here pretty regularly talking about maintaining and restoring the rule of law to certain areas of our activities as a government. And I think this is important. I've stated it over and over and over. We created a Republic by creating a Constitution that set up that form of government.

But our Founding Fathers knew that the moral underpinnings of a Republic were required for that Republic to succeed. And they knew that there had to be implanted and instilled in the hearts and minds of Americans who would be—would maintain this Republic, a certain inbred understanding that there were rules that governed our society and our behavior and that there were morals and ethics which should be applied to what we do as we operate this Republic.

You will recall that when Benjamin Franklin was asked, when he walked outside of the Constitutional Congress, and they said, "Mr. FRANKLIN, what kind of government have you given us?" He said, "We have given you a Republic."

Now, God help us that we can keep it. And the whole purpose of that statement is to point out that he was fairly confident, as was every one of our Founding Fathers, that at that point in time in the United States of America there was a moral and ethical underpinning of society, and that if we would maintain that moral and ethical underpinning of society, we would be able to keep our Republic.

But I don't think any Founding Father envisioned a society in which indi-

viduals thought they would make the choices as to which rules applied to them and what rules did not apply to them, and they would not abide by the rules that society had set but rather the rules that they had chosen to govern their own lives. Because that's not a Republic; that's anarchy.

Now, we've been talking about some things that are going on in our society and in this Congress that have to concern everybody. And they have to concern them in a big way because they affect the attitudes of those who govern here in the Congress and those who are involved in this governmental process.

I've tried to raise and point out some things that I think are of dire concern, and I will continue to do this because I spent most of my entire adult life basically following as best I could and trying to enforce those rules that this society has established for itself to operate in.

And when I came to this Congress as a new Member of Congress almost 8 years ago now, I was told there were rules that govern this body—all of the people who serve in the United States Congress—and I very quickly tried to do my best—as I am sure every Member here has—to learn what those rules were. And they were not only just parliamentary rules, but they were fundraising rules, they were political rules, they were reporting rules, they were tax-paying rules. There's lots of rules that govern the activities in this body.

I had started talking about this because I see a trend, and I see things that are happening that make me concerned that there are those who don't think certain rules apply to them.

I am going to point out what the President of the United States said as he started out his term: "I campaigned on changing Washington and bottom-up politics. I don't want to send a message to the American people that there are two sets of standards: one for the powerful people and one for the ordinary folks who are working every day and paying their taxes." This was stated by Barack Obama to CNN February 3, 2009. And it's a noble statement by the President.

That's sort of what I am trying to talk about right now.

And I've got a laundry list that I went over last week, and this list is pretty much the same list but with some exceptions. I've added some things and taken up another subject.

But I want to start with something that's made the headlines here very recently, and that's this organization known as ACORN, which we discovered by watching television and seeing events on television, that people who were established to do certain things under the rules in fact forgot those rules and did others. And this House voted 345-75 for an amendment to bar the Federal funding to ACORN after these undercover investigators uncovered four ACORN offices engaged in blatant mortgage loan fraud and aiding and abetting prostitution.

In my opinion, that was the right vote. I am proud of my colleagues who voted for it, and I think we need a stand-alone bill—not a bill that's an amendment to another bill—that would restate the very obvious: That no Federal moneys should be distributed to those who would blatantly commit mortgage fraud and aiding and abetting prostitution. And many of us saw that, saw it live and in color on television.

But in addition to those videos, we have had our bodies here in this Congress out doing some investigations of ACORN, and they have found a lot to be concerned about.

They found a nationwide history of crime—most of it relating to the last election, but not all of it; some of it relating to mortgages and other things that they were supposedly there to advise the uneducated and the uninformed as to what was available for them, especially the poor and the underprivileged, so that they might attempt to prosper in our society. They sounded like a good cause.

But if you will examine with me this list for just a moment, these are things that our Oversight Committee has found and brought forward. There are things that have been brought forward by the press, and there are things that have been brought forward by court records.

In Colorado we had allegations of voter fraud with multiple counts with convictions. So people were convicted of that crime. In Florida, voter fraud with cases pending in the courts; in Michigan, vote fraud with multiple counts with convictions in the State of Michigan; Minnesota, vote fraud with multiple counts with convictions in Minnesota; Missouri, mail fraud and identity theft, multiple counts with convictions in Missouri; Nevada, vote fraud, multiple counts pending; Ohio, vote fraud, multiple counts with convictions; Pennsylvania, vote fraud, multiple counts with convictions; Washington State, vote fraud, multiple counts with convictions.

Notice how many times the words "with convictions"—which means—I think everybody knows what that means. It means a finder of fact and a ruler of law made a judgment that these people had violated the law, and they convicted them of breaking that law, and I assume they assessed some form of punishment against them.

So this is a case, I would argue, of just what I was talking about when I started talking today, that someone—and I would argue a whole group of someones—have made a decision that certain laws don't apply to them and therefore, they blatantly—across the United States in a very short period of time, basically the last election cycle—they went out and violated these laws and these rules because they made their personal judgment that the law that we as a society established didn't apply to them.

This is moral relativism run amok, and it's done with \$55-plus million of

United States money because that's how much money we have heard that we have allocated and given to ACORN to do their business.

And by the way, we have bills that have passed this House that the Democrat majority have put in other funding mechanisms to the tune of \$8 billion, and that's why when we address this very issue that we would no longer fund ACORN, we need to make sure that that includes those things already approved for sources of revenue for ACORN. Because if you're not going to follow the rules of law, there needs to be consequences in our society.

So we start off with this supposedly great helping organization called ACORN.

□ 2115

The next thing I want to address here tonight, and I see that I'm joined by one of my good colleagues, and if he would like to have some of the time, I would be sure glad to give him some, is the fact that Dr. RON PAUL has raised an issue before this body that I think we ought to be concerned about and that we ought to think about, and that issue that he has raised is that we have turned over an awful lot of money to the Federal Reserve, and the Federal Reserve has independently of this body issued an awful lot of additional indebtedness and printed an awful lot of additional money, and we would like an accounting of what is going on.

I think it's kind of important, and I would venture to say that if anybody walks up to anybody who serves in this House of Representatives and says, Where is the money we put in the TARP bill? Can you account to me where that TARP money is? Can you tell me where the stimulus money is and what has happened to it? I have been asked the question all the time. How much have we spent? Well, what we know is that the press says we've spent this or the press says we've spent that, but we should know that. I mean, we are the people that were sent here by the American folks to take care of their business.

The Federal Reserve has been designed because it has an effect on our economy. The theory is you've got to keep their activities sort of off in a dark mist so nobody really knows what is happening so you don't cause a run on one part or the other of the economy. And I don't have a problem with that.

But it comes down to the fact that this Congress has turned over \$1 trillion worth of American indebtedness, basically money we don't have, money we are borrowing from other nations like China and others that are buying our paper so that we can issue these huge amounts of money. And if you take the TARP and the stimulus bill, it's \$1 trillion, well, you've got to ask—and there's more than that, you've got more than that—but we ought to know.

So Congressman PAUL has introduced H.R. 1207, and he is asking that we look

into what's going on with our money. He says that we've given the Fed \$700 billion in Bush TARP funds, and the Congress has given \$787 billion in Obama stimulus funds, so that's \$1.4 trillion and some change that we've given to the Fed, and yet the taxpayers and the Members of Congress have no way to independently verify what in the world the Fed has done with this money or where it is or who it went to or anything.

Now, we read about it in the newspapers. I used to tell juries when they would come before me, I would say, now we've got a case on trial here today that may be in the newspapers or on television or on radio, or there may be something out there in the news about this case. But I don't want you to listen to any radio broadcast, view any television programs or read anything in print about this case because, believe it or not, they don't always get it right. And we want you to only base your opinion on the evidence you hear in this courtroom under the rules of evidence. I'm sure my friend, Mr. GOHMERT, Judge GOHMERT, has done exactly the same instruction. And the reason is, you don't really know if the newspapers know what they're talking about. I like to hear what they have to say, but you don't know.

So why should the people that sit in these chairs around this whole big room, why should those people not have an answer to that question, Where is my money? Who is spending it? Where is it going to? How much is left? I think the guy that owns the garage on the corner down the street from me, he pays his taxes, he is entitled to know. His children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren are inheriting the debt we have created for them. They ought to be able to know what we are doing with it today.

And do you know what? That kind of number is a potential for disaster if somebody is crooked. Because it's such a big number, how are you going to know? There can be people stealing billions of dollars, and we don't know. So we ought to know.

I think Dr. PAUL has a good bill here. Let me ask my friend, LOUIE GOHMERT from east Texas and a fellow judge, I will yield such time as he may wish to spend on this subject of the Federal Reserve and the fact that we probably ought to have an audit that is reported back to this Congress.

Mr. GOHMERT. I appreciate my friend yielding.

This is a very important issue, and actually if you go back to the original bailout bill a year ago, as I read through it, and I did, I didn't read the extra pages that were added for pork at the end, but one of the things that caught my eye was here was a bill for \$700 billion for bailout, basically a slush fund for the Treasury Secretary; but in the bill it raised the debt ceiling \$1.3 trillion. Now that caught my eyes, because I know \$700 billion is less than \$1.3 trillion. So I went back through

reading again for any loopholes that might allow for the expenditure of more than \$700 billion.

Well, we know that before the bill finally passed, there was about \$100 billion in pork added in order to get enough votes so that it would pass. That still leaves half a trillion dollars between what the debt ceiling was raised and how much was appropriated in that bill. So I went back through, and one of the things that intrigued me was a provision that allowed the Secretary of the Treasury to hire, utilize whatever personnel was necessary in order to carry out the intentions of the bill.

Well, I was impressed and went to one of the Treasury people privately and asked, what does that mean? Are we going to have a new department of asset management? Are we going to set up a whole new bureaucracy here in Washington? Is there going to be \$500 billion spent setting up this kind of extra bureaucracy? And the answer I got was basically, and it was unofficial and informal, but was basically, look, we will hire some people, but ultimately this is going to be so much work we'll have to outsource it.

Well, I don't know if my friend from Texas noticed, but it turns out that the favorite firm of the former Secretary Paulson and the current Secretary Geithner had its biggest profit in the history of Goldman Sachs in the second quarter of this year.

So when my friend talks about transparency, wouldn't it be nice to know how much of that \$3.44 billion in clear profit that Goldman Sachs made came from taxpayers, came from the United States Government? But do you know what? There is only one way we really get to know exactly where all that money came from and how much went from the Federal Government. Sure, Goldman Sachs will have to file reports and whatnot, but it would really be nice to see from the government's own reports just how much Federal money is going Goldman Sachs' way, and how much money is being funneled from here in Washington to Wall Street. That would be important to know.

I think one of the things that we have seen, especially in the last several months, is that just because it's good for a Wall Street firm doesn't mean it's good for the stock market and it doesn't mean it's good for rank-and-file Americans who are paying their taxes to keep this government running who also were called upon as they saved and scrimped and tried to meet the demands of the day to be called on to bail out the Wall Street firms. And so it would be nice if maybe they would share a little more than what we are able to see.

I also want to point out the subject of transparency is so important. There is not much that is more cleansing than sunshine. Sunshine, you get enough of it, the mold and mildew just dries up and dies. You get enough sunshine, and things clean up, you get rid

of all the mold and nastiness. And yet what we get around here is people are left in the dark and fed lots of manure. Well, that will grow plenty of mushrooms, but that is not what we are supposed to be about here in Congress.

So the rules of the House, the rules of the Federal Reserve it seems like right now, they are just being played fast and loose, which parenthetically that gives rise to a situation we have right here tonight this week where we played fast and loose with the rules so you have a Defense appropriation, a defense authorization bill where you bring in a hate crimes bill, and I know there's a lot of agreement over what its effect will be; but clearly, one of the effects will be that it will make homosexuality and transgender a protected class.

The elderly were rejected. We weren't going to give them any added protection. Of course, some of us fought for the elderly. If you're going to give anybody protection, how about the elderly? They are commonly sought out. But, no, they weren't protected. And they certainly hadn't been protected in this administration's proposals for Medicare cuts, half a billion—I'm sorry—half a trillion basically in Medicare cuts. So I guess the thinking is we're not going to protect the elderly as much as homosexuals, transgender or even pedophiles. We tried to have an amendment that would exclude pedophiles from a protected class under the hate crimes bill, and that was rejected along party lines basically. So anyway we are not going to protect elderly as much as these sexuality lifestyle groups.

And then we turn around and we tack that hate crimes bill on to the military or Defense appropriation or Defense authorization. We've got soldiers out in the field needing this bill, and we're going to play fast and loose with the rules. We will not be allowed to amend this on the floor; we will not be allowed to change anything about this. It's take it or leave it. And I just think it is so outrageous while we have soldiers in the field to use this Defense authorization bill that's going to help our soldiers protect us, it's going to protect them while they protect us, and you tack on a hate crimes bill to the Defense authorization? Just how much disrespect can somebody have for the rules of this body and for procedure to do that kind of thing? It is just outrageous.

But then as you see these kinds of things coming into play, you see the lack of what really is strong morality in our financial laws, in our transparency. And it was Chuck I heard earlier this year was pointing out that when you lose morality, you're going to have economic chaos; you're going to have economic instability. And when you lose economic stability, people—and this is so tragic—but people throughout history, when they have economic chaos are always willing to give up liberties to gain economic sta-

bility. You lose morality in the Federal Reserve, in the Treasury of the United States, and in ACORN and all the voting laws and the procedure of this body. You lose what is just right. You lose that, and it contributes to economic instability, and then that gives rise to economic chaos. And people always give up their liberties trying to get economic stability.

So I think we get back to that sense of morality when you start having transparency, when you're able to see what's going on, when it's not behind closed doors, when it's not some private group with an agenda out there drafting the Employment Non-Discrimination Act who has their own lifestyle agenda, when it's not some group behind closed doors saying let's push through this stimulus bill, it may not stimulate America, it won't spend money, most of it for 2 years, it really won't do what we are saying is stimulus, but, boy, will it enrich our friends.

□ 2130

We have to get away from that or we are going to lose this country. We cannot continue down this road with a lack of candor, with a lack of openness and honesty. We have got to return to transparency. That will help address the issues of this country. Sunlight always has a way of doing that.

Mr. CARTER. I thank my colleague for his passion. You know, it is very simple: We expect the Fed to look at our banks back home and make sure that they are handling our money right. I don't think anybody I know has close to a billion dollars in the bank, and yet we expect the people that we put in charge of our money to have somebody looking over their shoulder to make sure that they are doing the right thing.

This is the largest chunk of money on the face of the Earth right here, and I don't think it is too much to ask somebody to look over their shoulder and decide what is going on.

Mr. GOHMERT. If my friend would yield, this is such an important point.

Through the economic downturn over the last year or so, a lot of people across America have confused community banks and investment banks. They have just lumped them all in together, and there is a major difference. You have community banks who have to have complete transparency. They have Federal regulators who come in and check every dot and tittle. They have to make sure that everything is just the way the Federal regulators want it. Some of us have been concerned that over-aggressiveness by Federal regulators in the most stable of our financial institutions, the community banks, has helped dry up a great deal of the credit.

So imagine the hypocrisy to have Federal regulators just swarm in like locusts to community banks which are the most stable and have been the most careful in Federal banking, and they

are being regulated by people who will not open their books to this Congress. That in itself is such an outrage that it alone ought to be a basis for getting RON PAUL's bill here to the floor, get it passed, and let's open them up. I love what Newt Gingrich said: If transparency is good enough for the CIA, it really ought to be good enough for the Federal Reserve.

Mr. CARTER. That is very good.

I am going to change gears here because I have serious business on the floor of this House tomorrow. For every week of this year, just about, I have come before this body and I have discussed with them the fact that we have serious allegations that have been made against the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. RANGEL. I have asked repeatedly that Mr. RANGEL do the right thing and resign his position as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee until such time as these allegations have been dealt with by the appropriate authorities. A lot of this is supposed to have been dealt with and we have been promised would be dealt with by Speaker PELOSI. She told us, by the end of 2008, the Ethics Committee would have resolved Mr. RANGEL's issues.

So I am going to just go briefly over a few.

Mr. RANGEL admits to underreporting income and assets for 2007 by more than half, including failure to report income from his Caribbean resort property again. By the way, I say "again" because that's the allegation that started all of this information about Mr. RANGEL.

Mr. RANGEL's aides have now also filed amended disclosure forms revealing similar underreporting by them.

The Committee on Standards is still investigating Mr. RANGEL's lease of multi rent-controlled apartments in Harlem; his use of the House parking spot for long-term storage for his antique Mercedes; his failure to report and pay taxes on rental income on his resort villa in the Dominican Republic; an alleged quid pro quo trading legislative actions in exchange for donations to a center named for Mr. RANGEL at City College of New York; a gift rule violation on trips to the Caribbean sponsored by the Carib News Foundation in 2007 and 2008; and now Mr. RANGEL has the audacity to push through a bill in this body today increasing tax penalties on his fellow taxpayers on the heels of Secretary Geithner's crackdown on UBS depositors for failure to pay taxes.

So, you know, tomorrow I will be offering to this body a very important piece of legislation, a document called a privileged resolution, asking this body to consider what Mr. RANGEL refuses to do, and that is the right thing.

We cannot have the chief taxing authority of this body with the allegations, and there are many more than these, these are just a few. There is another full page just like this of different allegations. We cannot have the

chief of values over the IRS, the man who writes the tax laws for this House of Representatives, as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. It is a travesty of justice for him to serve as the chairman of that committee when the American citizens back home, they realize that he has been getting special treatment on his tax problems and those problems he has not faced, the onerous issues that they have to face when they have the IRS finding that they haven't paid their taxes, and he is doing, we are seeing just what President Obama said he didn't want to see, and that is people of power being treated differently than the ordinary American citizen. That is why I have raised this issue.

When I read what the President said, that gave me the incentive to do this. It does not please me at all to raise issues against any Member in this body, but I am telling you, this gives an appearance of wrongdoing and an appearance of impropriety at the least on behalf of Mr. RANGEL, and good governance tell us he should not be in this position of power until the issues are resolved.

I will be the first to say if they are all resolved and concluded to be irrelevant and not any kind of wrongdoing or breaking of the rules, I will be the first to say Mr. RANGEL ought to be the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. He ought to be put back in there. But it is not right for him to be there.

So tomorrow, I will ask this body to remove him from that position.

Does the gentleman wish to comment on the issues with Mr. RANGEL?

Mr. GOHMERT. It goes back to the issue of transparency. Everybody needs to be accountable under the same rules no matter who it is. And actually, this weekend, I had a number of people commenting on how unfair it was of Congress to be judged by one standard, and specifically mentioning the chairman of the Ways and Means, and the rest of America to be judged by another standard. It is difficult for the American people to understand.

If that were me, I couldn't do this. I would have had to pay the penalty and interest. I mentioned to my friend previously about my constituent, Mr. de le Torre, and he was very proud of his Hispanic descent. He said de le Torre meant "of the tower." Apparently he had some royalty back in Spain some centuries ago.

But here he had four permanent employees, four part-time employees, and he had a sheet metal business, and he had no problem with me mentioning his name and his own situation. And with the downturn in the economy, he wanted to protect his employees. He did not want to let them go. He knew they were struggling, and he certainly was struggling. And, of course, he is the last one to get paid. He didn't have any money. And yet the quarterly payment had to be made for the portions of Social Security and the Federal tax

on that payroll, and he did not have the money. And because of the additional pressures being brought to bear by the Federal Reserve, who will not be transparent against community banks, which are doing everything they can and have been transparent, he wasn't able to get a loan. He could not get a loan or a line of credit to make his payment, his quarterly payment to the government.

So he notified them, filed how much he owed, but said, I don't have any cash. I don't want to fire any of my employees, and I can't get a loan or a line of credit to make my quarterly payment.

They let him know you owe penalty and interest. We are coming after you. He was telling me that he has since been notified that they are going to start seizing his accounts and his assets, sell them off if necessary, but seize his assets if he does not make his penalty and interest payment.

So it is kind of hard for a guy like that who is being loyal to these people, the eight people who work with him and for him, how a guy that is chairman of the committee that writes the tax laws can do far worse and not be open, not just be completely transparent in what has happened.

The chairman of the committee doesn't have to pay penalty or interest, and yet this poor man does. It is hard for him to understand, and it is hard for rank-and-file Americans to understand. It is not the standard that this Congress should be establishing. I so hope that we can get back to being a Congress that leads by example.

You know, I think about the words of George Washington. He was a man who had incredible bravery. We would not have the Nation as we know it if it were not for his humility, his willingness to resign and go home after winning a revolution. His words, his exact words were, "A people unused to restraint must be led; they will not be drove." And that was okay English back in those days.

I look at what we are doing now. We are dealing with a country that is not used to restraint, and yet the financial taxation laws are restraining Americans like never before, not so much because of the percentage but because of the actual effect on Americans. And we are not leading as Washington implored. We are trying to drive Americans to do what this Congress has not done and should be doing, and that is lead by example.

And we were promised by the Speaker that this would be the most transparent and open and accountable Congress. That simply has not happened. In fact, to the contrary. I don't know that there has ever been one that has been more closed and protective of its own, and that really has to change.

I yield back to my friend.

Mr. CARTER. I agree. There will be more about Mr. RANGEL tomorrow.

I want to bring up something else. We have had a lot of issues to do with

automobiles in this country, and now we have somebody at least that is trying to say, you know, the United States Constitution, section 10, says no State shall pass any ex post facto law or law impairing the obligation of contracts or grant any title of nobility.

This is the Auto Dealers Economic Rights Restoration Act, and this bill prohibits automakers in which the Federal Government has ownership interest or which receives loans from the Federal Government from depriving an auto dealer of its economic rights.

What they are talking about is it seems that these automobile dealerships when they were in the bailout position with the Federal Government—and, quite frankly, General Motors stands for "Government Motors," as far as I am concerned, and Chrysler is sort of in the same boat. I understand Fiat was buying some of that. I am not sure that they made the purchase.

These people went out and made choices to break contracts with one auto dealer and award his customers to another auto dealer. There have been allegations made that these were political decisions. I have no evidence of that. But it is, you know, a right of contract, and they had a contract with these dealers, and because they were pressured, I would argue that they breached contracts with one group of dealers to put their sales into the hands of another dealer. For what reason is beyond my understanding.

□ 2145

But I think this is a good law because it says, this is a violation of the Constitution. This is not the way we do business in the United States. And you know what? We did the Cash For Clunkers, and oh, boy, the government was involved and the money was flowing and all's right with the world, although the government hasn't even started to pay for the clunkers yet. They're still out there processing the deals. And, you know, I think that's a great example, Cash For Clunkers is the perfect example. Do you really want the government running your health care if they can't even pay for junk cars on time? My Lord. I mean, but anyway, that's all part of another tangent.

Mr. GOHMERT. If the gentleman might yield on that point.

Mr. CARTER. I will yield to my friend.

Mr. GOHMERT. On the Cash For Clunkers program we know that there are many foreign vehicles that are manufactured here in the United States, and the American workers do a fantastic job. But it is worth noting that in this program that was rushed through so quickly without going through the proper order, without getting the proper scrutiny through committees and through proper chance for amendment here on the floor, where you can take a law that may have some problems and make it better, we're not allowed any of that opportunity.

And so what we got was a Cash For Clunkers program in which four of the five top vehicles that were purchased were foreign vehicles. Now, some of those were made in America, but most of them were made in foreign countries. In other words, the Cash For Clunkers vehicles helped foreign governments and foreign companies more than it helped American companies. And they want to run my health care. My goodness. Is that sad? If it weren't so tragic, how much we help foreign companies over our own U.S. companies, it would be a comedy. It's just outrageous.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time for just a moment. I will also point out that, to date, according to my auto dealers, they still haven't paid all the dealers for all the clunkers that they bought. So you know, that program has closed out, finished out, done, and there are some dealers with millions of dollars owed to them and the government hasn't processed those dollars in that thing. The important part of this bill is—

Mr. GOHMERT. If I might, on one other point. Unforeseen consequences too. Because we didn't have a chance to go through the proper channels and really look at this legislation, the Cash For Clunkers bill, one of the effects has been that the working poor in America have been the hardest-hit, because they were not able to come in and buy a brand new car with this attractive program because they didn't have the money to make the payments after that.

So it really didn't help the working poor in the United States. And, in fact, it hurt them because what happened under this Cash For Clunkers program is thousands of vehicles, used vehicles that would be sold cheaply to the working poor in America, cars they could afford, were just fixed to where they could not be run, could not be operated, could not be sold. That drives up the price of the used vehicles that the working poor in America really need to get to and from their jobs. So it hurt those who needed help in America the most and helped foreign companies over domestic companies. Now that's a government program that we're going to use, I'm sure, to model health care after.

Mr. CARTER. And you know, reclaiming my time, the reports this week have been that the sales from our two bailed-out automobile firms that are now part of Government Motors, are tragically low, and there's a lot of talk that they don't know if General Motors can even pull this out. So it's important. Mr. GOHMERT has hit upon something that's very important. It's important that we follow procedures and follow the rules. That's what we're talking about, the rule of law, follow the rules. We need to follow the rules of this House so we give a proper examination of every bill and every idea that passes through these halls.

And that's why we've got a bill by GREG WALDEN and JOHN CULBERSON and

BRIAN BAIRD that says how about us following the rules that are written into our book that was written by the Honorable Thomas Jefferson in the rules of this very House of Representatives, that says we're supposed to get three days to read a bill? And as Mr. GOHMERT pointed out, just the Cash For Clunkers bill didn't go through any committees, rushed in here. We saw it when we were voting on it and, bam, it was out there. And has it done any good for the automobile industry?

Maybe there was an idea sitting in one of these chairs that would have been a little bit better than the idea that came from who knows where, because it didn't go through a committee system to get through floor, and none of us had time to read it or come up with an idea or amend it, because the rules didn't allow us to amend it.

And that's what's happened on every bill that's been offered this year of any importance. It is brought to us, crammed down our throat, and we're not given the chance to even read it. The American people have made an outcry, and they're making an outcry about bills that are hard to read. I'll admit they're hard to read. But they're saying, why don't you read the bill that's going to change health care in America permanently? And so many of us struggled through it and did. But we're not enforcing a rule that says we should have 3 days to read this bill. We should.

If Americans send us to Washington to be their voice and cast their vote in Washington, D.C., and we are handed a document that may be 2,000 pages long and spend \$700 billion, and it gets to us at midnight and we're expected to vote on it at 10:00 the next morning and they drop in amendments after that, how in the world can we do the job the American people sent us to do here?

So this bill right here, the 3-day reading rule, is just ordinary good courtesy and common sense in a place where we spent, in the last year, in the last 6 months we've spent more than we spent in the history of the Republic. So maybe we should slow down. Maybe we should follow the rules and give us 3 days to read these bills. Sorry, but that's kind of a passion, I think, Mr. GOHMERT. I'll yield.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you. And the point about having time to read the bill could not be illustrated more clearly than on the stimulus bill that was basically crammed down this body's throat. We were promised by the President back when he was running for office that he was going to have, what is it, 4 or 5 days it would be up on the Internet, where all America could read these bills for days before we voted on them. But it gets a little hard to take the administration, the President, leaders of this body seriously when they all parroted that stuff and how they were going to do that.

And then on the stimulus bill we were told over and over, we didn't have time to read the bill. We just didn't. It

was filed, I think, after midnight. We're voting on it, over 1,000 pages. There was no time for anybody to read it. We were told that there were thousands of people losing their jobs every day. It had to become law immediately. There's no time to read it; just do it. Just do it. Just vote on it. Well, some of us still wanted to see what was in it. We voted against it, and yet it passed on that Friday, and so because it was such an emergency, they said, and we didn't have time to read the bill, we passed it on Friday, and then Saturday came and went, and Sunday came and went, and Monday came and went, and Tuesday, when the photo op was set up in Colorado for the President to sign the bill, he finally got around to signing the bill.

Why couldn't we have had those 3 days and voted on it on Monday if it was such an important bill and if the President had been serious and the leadership of this House had been serious about the importance of reading bills? Why couldn't we have had Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and then debated on Monday? But we were denied that, even though the President never had any intention of signing that bill for 4 days after it was signed. So it gets a little hard to take some of the acrimony on the floor seriously, as in that case, when we were just ridiculed for not being willing to sign it immediately and for wanting to read it when there just was no time to waste. Four days later, the President signed it.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, I call that the Chicken Little syndrome. The sky is falling. We've had the sky falling in this Chamber on more than one piece of legislation. Oh, my God, the sky is falling; the banks are dropping off a cliff, the economy's going to hell in a handbasket, and you've got to vote now. Don't bother to read it. Don't ask any questions. Give us the money. Trust us. Sign the check.

Well, and I'm telling you this, the same thing happened in the last waning months of the Bush administration, and I didn't support that then, and I won't support it now, because the sky's not falling. We're sent here to do a job, and we ought to be given the chance to read these bills. And I think this is a good bill. And I hope our leadership will let us bring this up. I'm coming down to the last thing I want to talk about tonight, and that is, we are setting history, because we now have more czars by twofold than the Romanovs in all the history of Russia, Imperial Russia.

And so we have a couple of bills, both of them dealing with czars, which say that they want to—Mrs. BLACKBURN wants to deal with the czars. And we'll start with Mr. SCALISE. Mr. SCALISE defines czars. We have now, and I may be corrected by my friend, Judge GOHMERT, but I believe we're at 34 czars, or maybe 36 czars have been created by this administration, which is like head and shoulders above any bunch of czars we've ever had. We've got czars for everything in the world.

In fact, the compensation czar today announced some compensation rules which were kind of interesting, and I think there's going to be some contract law matters that will probably come up on that. But we have a compensation czar. We have a czar probably, you know, furniture polish czar, for all I know. But sunset the czars. In other words, let's look at them, see what they're doing. If they're not doing anything worth having or they're duplicating efforts that are done by the people who've gone through the Senate appointment process and been vetted by the Senate, the secretaries of the various departments of this government, maybe we ought to just eliminate the czars.

Then our friend, MARSHA BLACKBURN, has a bill that the President is to report the responsibilities and qualifications that authorize the special assistance of czars. The President will certify that the czars will not assert powers beyond those granted by the law to a commissioned officer on the President's staff, and Congress will hold hearings on the President's report and certification within 30 days.

In other words, Mr. President, tell us what those folks are going to do, how qualified they are to do the job. We're going to pay them somewhere between \$175,000 and \$200,000 a year to do the job. And the Congress ought to be able to see that report and have the ability to deal with it. Both of these are good laws, and both of these have to do with czars. My friend, LOUIE GOHMERT, has been here with me for almost the full hour. We're about 5 minutes from conclusion, so I'll yield a couple of minutes to my friend, LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. With regard to the czars, we've seen over and over examples of people who have been placed in these positions, and it doesn't do me any good or anybody in America any good to say, well, you know, prior presidents have used czars. Not to this extent. Not ever, and I never really cared for them, no matter who the President was. I didn't like the bailout last year. I thought, until this administration, it was possibly the worst domestic action that's been taken in the last 50 or 60 years. That is, until this administration just left \$700 billion in the sand as it blew through more and more money. But then, to have this massive spending spree that's, while we've got people appointed by the White House, not properly vetted, and the more we find out about these people, the more we're concerned they should never have been in those positions in the first place.

And as we know, we've already had one recently step down, he should have never been there in the first place, whereas, if you went through regular order there and had advice and consent of the Senate, it doesn't mean they're going to be perfect. Nobody is. No process is. But there was real ingenuity in the process that was set up by the Founders, and the advice and consent

is an important issue. But the whole reason our Founders set up a President outside the main stream of Congress, unlike the parliament that elects a prime minister from this body, it was going to be from outside this body so that there would be more checks and balances, and the czars have done nothing but create Scars upon Thars—with all deference to Dr. Seuss—scars across America, as they have been unaccountable to the Congress, to the courts, to America. And that really has to be changed.

□ 2200

We need the sunlight. We need transparency. We don't need czars.

Mr. CARTER. Reclaiming my time, I agree with my friend and fellow judge from Texas. We don't need czars that don't answer to the people. We intentionally designed the executive department to stand with checks and balances over it, just like the legislative department is designed that way. We intended it. This is not the way our Founding Fathers intended this country to be run.

We've been talking tonight about the rule of law. It's about the rule of law. It's about following the rules. You know, if we don't hold each other to the standards that are required by this body, if we don't hold our colleagues to the standards that are required by this body, then why would we expect the American people to trust us? I will tell you, all of us need to be worried about the issue of trust. So I will continue to raise these issues, and I will be glad to be joined by anyone in this discussion to discuss following the rules and obeying the law.

MODIFICATION IN APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2647, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NYE). Without objection and pursuant to clause 11 of rule I, the Chair removes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. REYES) as a conferee from the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on H.R. 2647 and appoints the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) to fill the vacancy.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

REPEAL THE DON'T ASK, DON'T TELL POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and ex-

tend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, tonight, October 6, at 10:03 p.m., we have a very special night. My colleagues and I stand here tonight to champion the repeal of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy. Repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell is important. It's important for three reasons.

Number one, it is vital to our national security that we repeal Don't Ask, Don't Tell. We have kicked out over 13,000 troops since we enacted this law 16 years ago. We have kicked out over 400 troops just this year, in 2009. When our commanders on the ground are desperate for troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, now is not the time to throw them out—not for any type of sexual misconduct, but just because they're gay.

Number two, do we need to repeal Don't Ask, Don't Tell because it is doing right by our taxpayers? It is costing the American taxpayer \$1.3 billion to throw these young American heroes out of our military just because of their sexual orientation. It costs the American taxpayer \$60,000 to recruit these young heroes to come in, to train them up, to make them warriors, and then we just disregard them just because of their sexual orientation.

And, lastly, the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy goes against the very fabric of what makes our country the greatest country on Earth, the fact that we're all created equal.

Mr. Speaker, we have colleagues, Members of this great House here tonight to argue about the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. There are 176 cosponsors to repeal this act, but one of these Members is the highest-ranking enlisted soldier ever to serve the United States Congress. He was a command sergeant major. That is the highest rank you can become in the United States Army in the enlisted ranks. He is a sophomore Congressman from Minnesota. His name is TIM WALZ. He is an American patriot and a hero, and I'd like to turn it over to my colleague and my friend, TIM WALZ from the great State of Minnesota.

Mr. WALZ. Thank you to my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Thank you for your service in the military. Thank you for your leadership in this Congress and, especially, thank you for standing forward on this important issue. The colleagues who have joined us here tonight understand this issue is one of civil liberties, of basic human dignity and of national security.

As my colleague said, I had the privilege and the honor to serve this Nation for 24 years in uniform. I can tell you, there is no greater privilege than putting on the uniform of the United States Army and trying to do the best

you can to make sure that our personal liberties and our security of this Nation are maintained. The idea of denying that privilege and that honor to any American is simply unfathomable to me. It makes no sense. I can tell you, approaching this from a perspective—I'm a schoolteacher by profession—I had students that I taught in the classroom, coached on the football field, trained in my Guard unit, and they went off to Iraq to fight for this Nation. They went off to Afghanistan to fight for this Nation. Not once, not once in my career did the question of sexual orientation come up. Not once was the ability of that unit to deliver the security and deliver their mission ever predicated on sexual orientation. Not once did I see that this Nation was safer because a soldier was removed because of sexual orientation.

This issue and in the position I was in as a senior enlisted soldier, my whole purpose in life was to make sure our troops were trained; make sure they were prepared to do the mission and make sure their well-being was taken care of; make sure they could pass their physical proficiency test, make sure they could fire their weapon to the best of their ability; make sure they understood the mission and they understood the tactics to carry out the mission that was assigned to them to protect this Nation.

The professionalism of our troops is beyond question. The professionalism to be able to carry out a mission as assigned to them and to fall back upon their training has led us to have the most successful and proficient military in the world. The idea that these soldiers would be degraded because of the sexual orientation of someone doing the exact same thing alongside them is not only a fallacy; it is degrading to the professionalism of most soldiers there.

We serve today, right alongside in Afghanistan, 12 nations that allow their military to serve as openly gay and lesbian soldiers. Not one incident in that conflict has arisen because of that. And as my colleague from Pennsylvania so clearly pointed out, as that generation of young people willingly raise their hand at a time of two wars to serve this Nation, we're turning out some of the most skilled warriors and turning them out of the military for a bias on sexual orientation that has no place, has no need, and is not undermining our security.

My colleagues here tonight are going to make and have already made a very eloquent case for this. The United States public has a very strong preference that we allow people to serve in the military. We allow them to do their duty. We make sure that our Arab linguists are there, and we've sent many of them out the door because of this archaic and outdated policy. It doesn't reflect the values of this Nation. It doesn't reflect what we know in the military as a sense of trust amongst comrades.

There is a very eloquent quote—I think one of the most powerful speeches ever given, and it was given by the Marine Corps' first rabbi, Rabbi Gittleshon on Iwo Jima. Rabbi Gittleshon was chosen and asked to give the eulogy over the dead at the Battle of Iwo Jima. There was a strong bias about having a rabbi give last rites over Christian soldiers. The decision was made to have three different services. But during Rabbi Gittleshon's remarks, he was very clear about this: an enlisted man and an officer lay dead together, black and white, rich and poor, sons of immigrants and fourth-generation Americans. Not one of those people asked the other why they were there. His point was, theirs was the purest democracy, arm in arm, brothers and sisters in arms fighting for this Nation. And for any of us to discriminate against another because of any perceived bias was to disregard and disrespect the valor and the memory of those who have served.

So I want to thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, Captain MURPHY, an Airborne soldier, served honorably in Iraq and has served this Nation well. He came to Congress to do the same thing and has courageously stood up time and time again for what's right, what's for the best security of this country and what keeps in the best traditions of civil liberties in this country.

So I stand with my captain side by side on this. I can assure the American public, the professionalism of our force and the unwavering commitment to this country of the military is in absolutely secure hands, and to give other Americans the ability to serve and be a part of that is something that this Congress must do. So Captain MURPHY, I congratulate you. I thank you for doing this. I'm proud to stand with you. You have over 170 of our colleagues with you on this. It's time to move this forward. It's time to erase this mistake for our security and for Americans. I'll be with you every step of the way. So thank you for that.

With that, I yield back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Minnesota. There are two points that he mentioned that I would like to highlight. The first is the fact that there are 27 other nations that allow their troops to serve openly. Some of our toughest allies—Great Britain, Israel, the Aussies—they all allow their troops to serve openly with no detrimental effects.

□ 2210

Secondly, the command sergeant major mentioned Iwo Jima. I spoke to 250 senior leaders in the United States Army yesterday, and, unsolicited, I got an e-mail this morning from one of those colonels that I met with. And this Army colonel wrote me a note, and he said, "In fact, gay men and women have been serving honorably in our

military for decades." He sent me a moving passage from a book about World War II entitled, "Stories from the Pacific." Reflecting on his experiences, a Marine wrote:

"That lesson of tolerance was well learned by the men in our company. During three amphibious campaigns in which we took part in Bougainville to Iwo Jima, valor and unselfishness were commonplace. I saw bravery and sacrifice all around me.

"One of the most courageous men I met was our Navy corpsman, Billy Hauger, a teenage boy who always put our well-being ahead of his own. In combat, he cared for us. He bandaged our wounds and comforted our men as they died. Often he would leave his position of relative safety and move out into the hail of enemy gunfire to treat a downed marine or pull a man to safety.

"On Iwo Jima, he risked his life time and time again to take care of his fellow men. On his last rescue attempt, he was badly wounded when a Japanese Nambu machine gun put a round through his thigh and another high in his chest. Billy's wounds were life-threatening, and he was quickly transported out to the hospital ship for treatment. But Billy didn't make it.

"Billy was posthumously awarded the Navy Cross, our Nation's second highest honor for extraordinary heroism under fire. I loved Billy Hauger then and I will always love him. Billy Hauger was a homosexual. Every single marine in our company will be proud to stand with him and call him friend and brother."

He's looking down from heaven right now, and he's looking at us in this hall today. And I'm proud to stand with every one of you as we champion the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

With that, I yield to my colleague, the congresswoman from California, Mrs. LOIS CAPPS.

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. MURPHY, for yielding.

I am so honored to be with you this evening, and I thank you for organizing this time and for your leadership on this issue.

It's a humbling experience to come to the podium and come to the well following the eloquent testimony that you and our colleague TIM WALZ have given us, the two of you having distinguished yourselves in uniform serving our country on the battlefield. And your eloquence in your statements and also your testimony to the importance of this legislation gives credibility to it and credence to it that you alone uniquely, I believe, in this body have that ability to do, and I thank you that you are stepping up and leading this effort.

I am honored to join you. I believe it takes those of you who served to express your leadership in this way, but I also believe that the rest of us who didn't have that experience of serving but who are so grateful to those who

did want to join you in this kind of effort. I am so honored to stand here this evening tonight with our colleagues from different parts of the country, from different backgrounds and experiences, all with this conviction that we have and lending our support to the Military Readiness Enhancement Act.

It's been stated already, and it's going to be stated again, Don't Ask, Don't Tell is discriminatory, detrimental to the productivity of our Armed Forces, and it really contradicts the very foundation of equality that the United States of America is founded upon. Plain and simple, it is way past time for this prejudiced policy to end.

As you stated before, over 12,000 men and women have been discharged from the military since 1993 because of their sexual orientation, because of their sexuality. That's over 12,000 gifted and qualified individuals our military could not afford to lose in the first place.

We must keep the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell on our priority list in this Congress, and this issue must also remain on the national conscience as well. We have to seek out every opportunity that we can to educate our constituents that Don't Ask, Don't Tell threatens not only our national security but all of our inherent rights as Americans.

I'm very grateful for the countless individuals who are working in our communities to do just that. Many of them are current and former members of the military, and they do their service and they do our country a great honor by doing that, but I want us to widen that. We can't leave it up to those who have served to tell their story out of their own personal experience. We have to also join them because we are part of that movement as well. And there are numerous organizations working across the country to inform people and citizens, all citizens, about the injustice of this policy.

I am very proud that one of these organizations, the Palm Center, is located at the University of California, Santa Barbara, in my district. Nathaniel Frank is a senior research fellow at this center. I have listened to him and had him explain his research to me, but he has written also extensively about how detrimental this policy is in a book that he has published entitled, "Unfriendly Fire."

He explains how Don't Ask, Don't Tell has added to the challenge of recruiting and keeping qualified soldiers in the military, and he also describes how the ban undermines the unit cohesion that it is supposedly designed to protect. The very reasons for establishing this policy have had the effect of undermining troop morale and troop discipline. And this is evidence that has been gathered now, substantial enough, that it is way past time, as I said, for us to act on it.

With the assistance of organizations like the Palm Center, important volumes like "Unfriendly Fire," and the

testimony of our civilian and military allies, we can and really we must overturn the ban on gays in the military.

I applaud our President's stance on this issue, and I look forward to getting the Military Readiness Enhancement Act to his desk as soon as possible. I believe that's our goal, and I'm grateful, again, for the effort of this hour to lay the groundwork for it.

Every day that passes with the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy continuing in place, the United States military loses out on more and more qualified applicants. For a country at war, this is simply inexcusable, and it threatens the safety and security of our overstretched deployed troops today. Every effort needs to be taken to ensure that those serving in our Armed Forces have the materials, the support, and the work environment that they need to function most effectively.

□ 2220

The brave men and women serving today in our Armed Forces deserve nothing less than the ability to be honest about who they are.

Thank you again, Mr. MURPHY. Thank you to my colleagues for organizing this hour for giving us the opportunity to speak out on this very important issue, for holding this special order to bring further attention to the Military Readiness Enhancement Act.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the lady from California.

I would like to highlight the fact that Nathaniel Frank and Aaron Bell can do a great job at the Palm Center. They are truly our battle buddies in this cause to do what's right by our soldiers, our marines, our airmen, our sailors, and our coastguardsmen. And that's our job tonight.

Now it's my honor to turn it over to the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Jared Polis, who happens to be my sister and brother-in-law's Congressman, and I know Brian and Kathy Mergolis out there in Westminster, Colorado, are probably watching, and I would like to turn it over now to their Congressman, Mr. POLIS.

Mr. POLIS. Thank you for highlighting some of the research that was done in your district regarding this matter. And I would like to thank Representative PATRICK MURPHY for taking this challenge on, making our military stronger, saving taxpayer money.

I would like to bring the attention of our viewers to a very recent report that was published. It's called "The Efficacy of Don't Ask, Don't Tell" by Colonel Om Prakash. You can find it on the Internet. This was a study that was done by a student at the National War College. It actually won recently the 2009 Secretary of Defense National Security Essay Competition.

One of the quotes on the cover is from General Omar Bradley, and it says, "Experiments within the Army in the solution of social problems are fraught with danger to efficiency, discipline, and morale."

Now, of course this was not in relation to our current discussion. It was in reference to the racial integration of the United States military by Harry Truman in 1948.

At some point the experimentation, the so-called experimentation, becomes the exclusion. At this point in the evolution of our society, it is more experimental to use the military as a social incubator to try and deny gay and lesbian soldiers from serving than simply allowing them to serve. The military isn't the place for evaluating whether or not we as a society accept or don't accept homosexuality. It should be designed as a fighting force to defend our Nation. And anything that compromises that weakens our military and is not in our interest as a country.

The report by Colonel Prakash—allow me to quote from it—it says, "If one considers strictly the lost manpower and expense, 'Don't Ask, Don't Tell' is a costly failure."

Colonel Prakash further quotes the GAO's estimates that the cost is \$190.5 million for the previous 10 years of Don't Ask, Don't Tell. Not only does it cost money, but it costs lives. Whenever we put anything other than our best foot forward in terms of the very most capable personnel for every particular mission, we jeopardize the lives of other men and women serving in our military. We owe it to the men and women serving in our military to ensure that the most capable person is in every job, regardless of the race or the sexual orientation of that individual.

Colonel Prakash's report ends, "Based on this research, it is not time for the administration to reexamine the issue; rather, it is time for the administration to examine how to implement the repeal of the ban."

We have a number of other speakers here tonight, Mr. MURPHY, and that is a testimony to your leadership and the importance of this issue. I look forward to engaging in a discussion after we've all had a chance to say a few words.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I would like to highlight of this report—which is a terrific report—Colonel Prakash writes, "There are potential lessons to learn from other countries that have lifted the ban on homosexuals serving openly. There was no mass exodus of heterosexuals, there was no mass 'coming-out' of homosexuals. Prior to lifting their bans, in Canada 62 percent of servicemen stated that they would refuse to share showers with a gay soldier, and in the United Kingdom, two-thirds of males stated that they would not willingly serve in the military if gays were allowed. In both cases, after lifting their bans, the result was 'no effect.'"

In a survey of over 100 experts from Australia, Canada, Israel, and the United Kingdom, it was found that all agreed the decision to lift the ban on homosexuals had no impact on military performance, readiness, cohesion, or ability to recruit or retain. Nor did it increase the HIV rate among troops."

He concludes his article by saying, as you mentioned, "Don't Ask, Don't Tell has been costly both in personnel and treasure. In an attempt to allow homosexual servicemembers to serve quietly, a law was created by this Congress that forces a compromise in integrity, conflicts with the American creed of 'equality for all,' places commanders in difficult moral dilemmas, and is ultimately more damaging to the unit cohesion its stated purpose is to preserve."

"Furthermore, after a careful examination, there is no scientific evidence to support the claim that unit cohesion will be negatively affected if homosexuals serve openly. In fact, the necessarily speculative psychological predictions are that it will not impact combat effectiveness."

"Based on this research, it is not time for the administration to reexamine the issue; rather, it is time for the administration to examine how to implement the repeal of the ban."

And that, my friends, is from the Joint Force Quarterly. That is a publication from the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of our country.

With that, I would like to now turn it over to the congresswoman from California, Ms. LYNN WOOLSEY.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for organizing tonight's Special Order because the men and women who serve in our military deserve nothing less than our respect, our support, and our admiration, yet the Department of Defense continues to deny them the respect they have earned by pursuing a devastating policy that is nothing less than discrimination against gay servicemembers.

Don't Ask, Don't Tell requires that the military discharge gay, lesbian, and bisexual servicemen and women because of their sexual orientation. A servicemember could be the best sharpshooter, the best medic, or the best language specialist in the military; it doesn't matter if he or she is a captain or a cadet having served 3 days or 30 years. If that Member is openly gay, he or she is fired.

Don't Ask, Don't Tell denies our Nation their service, it denies our Nation—makes us less safe because this terrible and open discrimination in the military does no good. It takes away great members that should be working in what they want to do and helping us be safer day in and day out.

It's clear that Don't Ask, Don't Tell is a failed policy that not only punishes the thousands of highly qualified servicemembers who have been discharged from the military, but it wastes millions of taxpayer dollars as well. When you add up the cost of the training, the food, the lodging, the equipment, the uniforms, the staff support, and the transportation, our country makes a huge investment in our servicemembers to be the best in the world. But because of Don't Ask, Don't Tell, all of this training and funding is wasted if a trained servicemember is openly gay.

□ 2230

How can we invest the tens of millions of dollars in these young men and women, all of whom are desperately needed by the military, yet tell them they can't serve our country?

This inflexible policy continues to weaken our Nation's ability to protect and defend itself by retaining qualified servicemen and -women. We must stop this. Don't Ask, Don't Tell has to go away. I was a freshman when we put this terrible policy in place, and believe me, I worked really hard trying to defeat it, but it's there. Let's get rid of it.

Thank you, PATRICK, for doing this.

PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentlelady from California, and I look forward to partnering with her to do that, to right the wrong from 16 years ago in this Congress and to finally overturn that discriminatory piece of legislation and to make it right for our troops.

With that, I would like to turn it over to a fellow hockey player from the great State of Illinois, although he is a Black Hawks fan and not a Fliers fan. By the way, the Fliers won their home opener tonight 6-5 against the Washington Capitals, MIKE QUIGLEY.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Thank you. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his service as well.

Let me briefly try to put a human face on this. When you don't put a person on it, you can imagine it is hard to really understand the human cost with such a policy. I will give you two.

First of all, Lee Reinhart, 4 years after graduating from high school and after spending time at both public and private universities, Lee Reinhart decided he had simply not found his calling. So in September of 1995, Lee surprised his friends and family by joining the Navy. Lee served on board the USS *Cowpens* as an operations specialist working his way up to becoming a second class petty officer in the Combat Information Center, tracking both surface and air contacts.

While serving, Lee earned several medals and ribbons, including the Navy-Marine Corps Achievement Medal. Lee's tour of duty in the Navy was completed in August of 1999. After time in the Reserves and the events of September 11, 2001, Lee wanted to return to active duty, this time to make it a career. This time he chose the Coast Guard. But soon after joining, Lee became a target and was being investigated. Lee was given two choices: he could admit he was gay and be allowed to leave the military peacefully, or he could stay and undergo an investigation with the same end result, discharge.

The point of this story is obvious. Lee had completed a full enlistment in one branch and earned an honorable discharge, but while serving in another branch, the uneven and inequitable implementation of Don't Ask, Don't Tell ended his career.

The implementation of Don't Ask, Don't Tell is uneven and subject to in-

dividuals such as Lee to the whims and prejudices of individuals.

Second Lieutenant Sandy Tsao, like the President of the United States, our dear friend Sandy is a fellow former South Sider, this time from the Bridgeport neighborhood. Sunday, February 8, 2009, marked the 1-year service anniversary of her active duty full-time service to her country. Shortly thereafter she received an honorable discharge because of her orientation.

Ms. Tsao wrote a letter to the President of the United States. She writes: "I am a second lieutenant currently serving in the U.S. Army. In addition to being an officer, I am a Christian, a woman and a Chinese American. I am proud of all these identities. Lastly, I am also a lesbian. On September 21, 2007, I was appointed as an Army officer. In the oath of office, I swore that I would support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies foreign and domestic. Unfortunately, I will not be able to fulfill this oath because the current policy regarding sexual orientation contradicts my values as a moral human being."

Today is the Chinese New Year. I hope it will bring good fortune to you in your newly elect office. Today is also the day I inform my chain of command of who I am. One of the seven Army values is integrity. It means choosing to do the right thing no matter what the consequences may be. As a Christian, this also means living an honest life. I cannot live up to these values unless my workplace 'provides an environment free of unlawful discrimination and offensive behavior.'" That is an excerpt from the U.S. Army's Equal Opportunity Branch.

"We have the best military in the world, and I would like to continue to be part of it. My mother can tell you it is my dream to serve our country. I have fought and overcome many barriers to arrive at the point I am today. This is the only battle I fear I may lose. Even if it is too late for me, I do hope, Mr. President, you will help us win the war against prejudice so that future generations will continue to work together and fight for our freedoms regardless of race, color, gender, religion, national origin or sexual orientation."

For 24-year-old Sandy Tsao, we are too late. For the many other gay and lesbian servicemembers, our repeal may just be in time.

In my mind, having gone to Iraq, I looked at the brave men and women willing to make the ultimate sacrifice for our country, many of them as young as my own children. And I will tell you what I didn't see. I didn't see those as black or white, men or women, straight or gay, Democrats or Republicans. I saw Americans. I saw warriors. Don't Ask, Don't Tell is a policy so fundamentally hypocritical that it encourages citizens to put their lives on the line to serve a country built on freedom and democracy as long as they lie about who they are.

Lastly, I'm reminded always at times like this what President Lincoln said at Gettysburg. Now, it has been interpreted many ways, but I would like to think that the essence of what President Lincoln was getting to was, 87 years ago we created a country based on certain principles, the most important of which is that all of us are created equal.

What he was saying in Gettysburg is, Did we really mean it? Did we really mean everyone? And I ask my colleagues to think about that, especially in time of two wars, with storm clouds gathering over North Korea and Iran. Did we really mean it? Do we really mean it today, that all of us are created equal? I think we all are warriors, at least that much. Thank you.

PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from Illinois. Those personal stories of our heroes that wrote to you are very powerful and very moving. I will tell you since I took over the leadership of repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell by enacting the Military Readiness Enhancement Act, I have gotten letters from all over the country and from overseas in Iraq and Afghanistan. And one of those letters that touched my heart and frankly broke my heart was from a soldier in Afghanistan. See, when I served in Iraq 6 years ago, I had 19 of my fellow paratroopers in the 82nd Airborne Division that gave the ultimate sacrifice. But one of them committed suicide. One of those 19 never made it home to see his family again. But this letter broke my heart because, and you will see, this hero was dealing with the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy.

He writes: "Sir, as you know, military spouses and other family members are important parts of the larger 'team' that is essential for our national defense. But such support is fundamentally closed off to the partners of gay servicemembers, even though these partners may be making the exact the same sacrifices as their straight counterparts."

"And it's even worse. Gay servicemembers and their committed partners have to worry that an overheard phone call, an intercepted email, or other type of compromised private communication could lead to a humiliating, career-destroying investigation. This is no way to treat American patriots."

"I write of these matters from personal experience. When the 9/11 terrorist attacks occurred, I was in a serious long-term relationship. The extensive active duty I did after 9/11 put a serious strain on this relationship. The relationship fell completely apart during my first deployment to Afghanistan in 2003."

"One of the big risk factors contributing to soldier suicides is the breakup of serious relationships. This is exactly what I experienced, and in the context of a combat zone deployment. I can still vividly remember sitting alone in Afghanistan, cradling my government-issued pistol in my hands and fighting the urge to blow my own brains out."

"What made that personal struggle in Afghanistan particularly difficult was the isolation that was imposed on me as a consequence of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy. A straight soldier in a similar state of crisis could go to his commander, his first sergeant, or his 'battle buddy' for support. But if I as a gay soldier had gone to my commander with the details of my situation, he would have been obligated to start the process of kicking me out of the Army."

"The Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy is wrong. I say this not just as an individual soldier, but also as someone with extensive experience as both a platoon leader and company commander. When I have been in such leadership positions, I have had straight soldiers share with me some of the most shockingly intimate details about their personal lives. I was glad that these straight soldiers put their trust in me, because I was able to offer each one the counsel or moral support that he or she needed at that time."

□ 2240

"Gay soldiers should also have that right to go to a commander, a first sergeant, or a battle buddy and not have to the worry about the ramifications of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy. The Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy shackles the hands of leaders like me. It prevents us from giving all of our troops the supportive leadership they deserve. The Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy throws up walls between battle buddies. It is an ugly stain on our national honor."

I now yield to the new freshman, the gentlewoman from the great State of Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. Thank you so much, Congressman MURPHY. Thank you for gathering us here at this late hour and also for taking on the leadership role in this extremely important issue. I am very proud to be here with you and my other colleagues tonight who are taking the time to talk about how important this is. And I would like to add a few words that can't come close to expressing what people have done in letters and stories that have already been told, but I do want to add a few words from my own perspective.

In 1993, as we have talked about today, Congress passed the Don't Ask, Don't Tell law that mandates the discharge of openly gay, lesbian, or bisexual servicemembers. Under this law, as we all know and have been talking about, at least one individual a day on average is fired because they are gay or lesbian. Since 1994, that amounts to 13,000 servicemembers who have been discharged under the authority of this discriminatory act.

I am a freshman, as you mentioned, and I know this bill was passed in a different time, but as a freshman, coming in here with different eyes, as a new Member, nothing seems fair or reasonable about this policy. And as a member of the House Armed Services Committee, it is clear to me that this pol-

icy does nothing to keep our country safe. And it does nothing to move our country forward in protecting the very rights that the brave men and women of the military are fighting to protect.

In fact, I believe this policy has the opposite effect. Don't Ask, Don't Tell has been responsible for the dismissal of highly qualified soldiers, as we said, almost 13,000 soldiers, that our country desperately needs at a time when we are engaged in two active conflicts overseas.

We have talked a lot about this report which has just been recently released. And As Colonel Om Prakash recently said, as others have said in the Joint Force Quarterly, Don't Ask, Don't Tell has been costly both in personnel and treasure, and is ultimately more damaging to the unit cohesion its stated purpose is to preserve.

We talk a lot about the numbers, about our need for trained members, like experienced Arabic translators, which we know this damages. Tonight we have heard thousands of stories of the men and women who willingly serve our country and, oh, by the way, happen to be gay.

I heard a story recently of a soldier whose partner died while he was serving in Iraq. Because he was gay and because his partner was a male, he couldn't openly grieve or talk, just as you mentioned, to his commanding officer or to any other troops.

I heard about a young woman who wanted to follow in her father's footsteps but because she was openly gay, a lesbian, she could not serve in the military, and it was her life goal.

I, like many of my colleagues, have visited in Iraq and Afghanistan and I have seen the chaos and the confusion, the danger that our soldiers take on every day in which many of them serve.

In my State, like many other States, I attend the ceremonies where we send them off, where we welcome soldiers home, and I look at them, young and old, men and women. And I, like many others, attend the funerals when those soldiers don't come home, and I have hugged the parents of military members who don't come home and know the grief that they feel. But of all of those soldiers, whether you see them in Iraq and Afghanistan, you see them as they are going off, I just see young men and women, older men and women in the Guard who are willing to serve our country. I don't see anyone who is gay or straight. I see, as one of my colleagues said, Americans, people who are willing to serve.

I stand here today in support of every single one of our soldiers, no matter what their sex, their ethnicity, or their sexual orientation. They deserve our respect and deep gratitude and support, and every single one of them deserves the honor just as they are to serve our country.

Thank you so much for taking on this issue and being here tonight.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentlelady from

Maine. That was powerful. I tell you, you are doing a fantastic job as a new Member of Congress. We are proud to have you and lucky to have you in this Hall.

With that, I would like to turn it over to gentleman from New York (Mr. ARCURI), the former prosecutor from Utica, an Italian Catholic like my mother, who came in in the 2006 class.

Mr. ARCURI. I thank my friend from Philadelphia and for his courage and determination in being here.

This issue, I was sitting there and I turned the TV on this evening and I didn't know you would be here, and I saw you on the floor and I really wanted to come down. My comments pale in comparison to some of the comments made and stories told, but I think it is very important that people weigh in on this issue. This is not the kind of issue that is just reserved for people who have been in the military, but this is an issue that affects all Americans. We are so proud of the freedom our country represents, and there are so many thousands of people who have given their lives over the years to protect that freedom, and they did it to ensure freedom for future generations and to ensure that prejudice and discrimination did not continue as a blemish upon our country.

Don't Ask, Don't Tell is a blemish on our country and it needs to be repealed. It needs to be removed in the same way that any prejudice and any discrimination should be removed from the books of laws of our great country.

I am here tonight to say, first off, for your leadership in this very, very important issue and for stepping forward in the courageous way you have, and for leading the charge to do not just the right thing but the important thing, the critical thing for the future of our country, I stand with you. I am proud to be a cosponsor of your bill, and I am proud to be with you here tonight.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from New York. As Mr. ARCURI said, we should all weigh in and we shouldn't just leave it to those who have served in uniform. I tell you, in the Congress 40 years ago, over 75 percent had military experience. Now it is 23 percent of us here have military experience. I will tell you that you don't need to be a veteran, someone who wore the cloth of our country, to weigh in. And that is why it is great to have patriots like MIKE ARCURI, CHELLIE PINGREE, and like MIKE QUIGLEY, from all over this country, to stand up and do the right thing.

With that, I now turn it over to one of the true champions of equality in this Congress. The Congresswoman from Wisconsin has been in my home district in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, and we keep asking her to come back because she has more fans there than I do, I think. Luckily, she is not running against me in a primary. But I will tell you, Ms. TAMMY BALDWIN is a

true champion for all of us with what is right in America.

Ms. BALDWIN. I want to thank my friend and colleague both for your service to your country and for your leadership on this very critical issue. And also thank you for yielding me some time this evening to talk about it.

I join you in strong support of H.R. 1283, the Military Readiness Enhancement Act. We have heard throughout the evening in 1993 Congress passed Don't Ask, Don't Tell, a law mandating the discharge of openly gay, lesbian, or bisexual servicemembers.

At the time, this law was intended as sort of a compromise to allow gay and lesbian servicemembers to serve in the military so long as they did not disclose their sexual orientation, so long as they hid being gay, lesbian, or bisexual. In other words, this compromise required our servicemembers to conceal, at best, or to lie, at worst. And in an organization such as our military where trust and unit cohesion is so important, this was just untenable.

Fifteen years later, we know that Don't Ask, Don't Tell is misguided, unjust, and, flat out, it is a discriminatory policy. Not only does Don't Ask, Don't Tell damage the lives and livelihoods of our military professionals, it deprives our Armed Forces of their honorable service and needed skills.

The armed services have discharged almost 800 mission critical troops and at least 59 Arabic and nine Farsi linguists under Don't Ask, Don't Tell in the last 5 years. This is just indefensible.

Further, the financial cost alone of implementing Don't Ask, Don't Tell from fiscal year 1994 through 2003 was more than \$363 million. Now, we can't afford to lose any more dedicated and talented servicemembers to Don't Ask, Don't Tell, and surely we can put these dollars, these resources, to much better use.

□ 2250

Earlier this summer I had the pleasure of meeting Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Victor Fehrenbach. He's an exceptional serviceman who's being discharged under the Don't Ask, Don't Tell law. Lieutenant Colonel Fehrenbach has honorably served his country for 18 years as an F-15E pilot. He received nine Air Medals, including a medal for heroism during the 2003 invasion of Iraq. And he was handpicked to protect airspace over Washington, D.C. after the Pentagon was attacked on September 11, 2001.

Lieutenant Colonel Fehrenbach, who has flown combat missions in Iraq and Afghanistan, against the Taliban and al Qaeda, continues to serve while the recommendation for his honorable discharge moves forward to a review board and eventually to the Secretary of the Air Force. Just 2 years away from his 20-year retirement, this dedicated serviceman stands to lose \$46,000 a year in retirement and medical benefits for the rest of his life if he's discharged.

There are approximately one million lesbian and gay veterans in the United States today, as well as 65,000 lesbian and gay servicemembers currently serving in our Armed Forces. Like Lieutenant Colonel Fehrenbach, these brave servicemembers are fighting and dying for their country in two wars. They're making sacrifices, and some are making the ultimate sacrifice, just like their straight counterparts. It makes no sense, and I just believe it's flat out wrong to discharge capable servicemembers for something as irrelevant as their sexual orientation.

Now, as my colleagues have discussed this evening, the Military Readiness Act would prohibit discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation against any member of the Armed Forces or any person seeking to become a member. Further, the Act would authorize the re-accession into the Armed Forces of otherwise qualified individuals previously separated under Don't Ask, Don't Tell.

Finally, the Act would require that regulations governing the personal conduct of members of the Armed Forces are written and enforced without regard to sexual orientation. It's long past time for Congress to act to end discrimination against gays, lesbians and bisexuals in our Armed Forces by passing the Military Readiness Enhancement Act. So I stand ready to join my colleagues in repealing this dishonorable law as soon as possible and restoring justice and equality in our Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude, I really do want to commend you, my colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman PATRICK MURPHY, for your bold leadership and your work in helping us move closer to repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell. You have taken the lead in advancing this bill, and I look forward to working with you to see that day come.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentlelady from Wisconsin. And as she mentioned Lieutenant Colonel Fehrenbach, the fact that we trained him and spent millions of dollars on his training to do what's necessary to keep our family safe here at home and in a faraway place like Iraq and Afghanistan, and just to throw him out and just discharge him like that is really a stain. It is a stain on our military. And it's a stain on this Congress for not acting quick enough.

It reminds me—you know, I had the great honor to teach at West Point. I taught constitutional law at the United States Military Academy at West Point. I was there from 2000 to 2003. And Forbes Magazine just rated West Point the number one college in America. It costs the American taxpayer about a quarter-million dollars to train each one of those cadets to become second lieutenants, to become leaders of character, not just for the 5-year active duty military commitment, but for a lifetime of service.

One of those cadets when I taught there was Lieutenant Dan Choi. Lieutenant Choi is an Arabic speaker, an Army officer, an Iraq war veteran and another one, one of the 13,000 that we just threw out of the military, not for any type of sexual misconduct. And let's be clear. If there's sexual misconduct, whether homosexual or of a heterosexual nature, throw them out. But just because he was gay, just because of his sexual orientation, and that is wrong. I'd now like to turn it over to my colleague, Mr. JARED POLIS, for any comments that he may have.

Mr. POLIS. You know, I'm struck by the sharing of the number of stories, a lot of similarities, many service men and women over the last decade and a half since this policy has been implemented, kicked out for no good reason. You know, what company, and I come from the business sector, could do this kind of thing? It doesn't increase your competitiveness. If you have people that you put hundreds of thousands of dollars into training, and then you don't like who they date and so you say, you're fired. You have people with excellent performance ratings, top of the category and you are saying, sorry, we're going to put somebody who might have a lower rating in your job because, again, we don't like who you date.

That's no way to run a company. It's no way to run a country. It's no way to run the best military. And what we owe to every one of our men and women who are in uniform, who put their lives at risk every day, is to make sure that we put our best foot forward militarily and do everything in our power to protect every life of every man and woman who serves. And when we remove people who would perform better, who are needed for certain functions, who have to cost more to retrain, we jeopardize the lives of other soldiers who are serving with them.

This also has an effect on recruitment and retention within the military. I heard a few weeks ago from somebody who's currently serving. He was facing a decision of whether to reenlist for another few years. He said, You know, when do you think don't ask don't tell will end? If you think it's going to end soon I'm going to re-up for another 5-year period. If not, I'm probably going to get out now.

I didn't know what to tell him. I said, well, Representative MURPHY's working on it, and I have every degree of confidence in him. I said, I hope that we will get it done in the next year or two. I think we will.

If he chose to leave the military, that's our loss. That's our military's lost. The cost of replacing that individual, the cost of training somebody to get up to speed at a time when we need more men and women to serve in uniform, is a cost to taxpayers and a cost to our national security. All of these stories resound that we are engaging in an extremely short sighted policy. How can be it be argued that all

of these excellent men and women with great command, great evaluations that are kicked out for no particular reason other than who they date, how can it be argued that that makes our military stronger? It simply doesn't. And we need to correct this policy to ensure that we have the very best military to defend our national interests here and abroad.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the gentleman from Colorado. I know our time is almost over. But I will tell you, you know, one way to run a company, one way to run the military, but I will tell you that there are military leaders that have served our country that are adamantly opposed to discriminating and going further with this Don't Ask Don't Tell policy. I will note one of them was the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a four-star general, General John Shalikashvili. He's written two op-eds, and I particularly want to point out the one where in 2007 he wrote an op-ed in *The New York Times* entitled "Second Thoughts on Gays in the Military."

He particularly points to a generational shift in the attitudes of our servicemembers towards gays and lesbians. So he writes: "When I was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I supported the current policy because I believed that implementing a change in the rules at that time would have been too burdensome for our troops and commanders. I still believe that to have been true.

"The question before us now though is whether enough time has gone by, 16 years, to give this policy serious reconsideration. Much evidence suggests that it has.

"Last year I held a number of meetings with gay soldiers and marines, including some with combat experience in Iraq, and an openly gay senior sailor who was serving effectively as a member of a nuclear submarine crew. These conversations showed me just how much the military has changed, and that gays and lesbians can be accepted by their peers.

"I now believe that if gay men and lesbians served openly in the United States military, they would not undermine the efficacy of the Armed Forces. Our military has been stretched thin by our deployments in the Middle East, and we must welcome the service of any American who is willing and able to do the job.

"By taking a measured, prudent approach to change, political and military leaders can focus on solving the Nation's most pressing problems while remaining genuinely open to the eventual and inevitable lifting of the ban. When that day comes, gay men and lesbians will no longer have to conceal who they are, and the military will no longer need to sacrifice those whose service it cannot afford to lose."

□ 2300

In conclusion, Mr. POLIS, I am proud that you are my battle buddy in this

endeavor. Again, there are 176 of us. We are hoping to get more of our colleagues. We need 218 votes. I will yield to you for 30 seconds and any closing comments you may have.

Mr. POLIS. In addition to General Shalikashvili, one of the original cosponsors of the bill, former Representative Barr of Georgia, has come out in favor of the repeal. The former Commander in Chief of the United States military, President Bill Clinton, who signed Don't Ask, Don't Tell, has come out in favor of a repeal. The times have changed, and what was, in our judgment at one time, a decision of military preparedness, it might have been that good minds disagreed with whether it was in our interest back in the early nineties, that idea has changed. The tone of the country has changed, and it is more than time. The time has long passed to end this policy of discrimination within our military.

Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. I appreciate those comments. Also, another former chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Colin Powell, has actually come out and said that it is now time to reevaluate it. So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, to the men and women at home, across our country and overseas in places like Iraq and Afghanistan, now is the time to act in the sense of urgency to repeal Don't Ask, Don't Tell. It is vital to our national security. No longer can we afford to let go of 13,000 qualified and honorable troops. We must do right by our taxpayer. It makes no sense that we spend \$1.3 billion to train these heroes up and then to just kick them out because of their sexual orientation.

And lastly, this policy is simply un-American. It goes against the very fabric which makes our country great, that we're all created equal.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to express my support for repealing the United States military's "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy.

I want to thank my colleague, Congressman PATRICK MURPHY for organizing this Special Order Hour on the importance and urgent need for repealing "Don't Ask, Don't Tell."

I have long been a friend and an ally of the lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) community and I am committed to the cause of equality.

I understand first hand discrimination based on racial prejudice, war hysteria, and a failure of political leadership. President Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed Executive Order 9066 on February 19th, 1942 which forced 120,000 Japanese Americans into internment camps during World War II.

Many of these families, including mine, lost their property and possessions during the several years they were jailed behind barbed wire.

Once again we find ourselves in perilous times. Our country and our civil liberties are constantly in jeopardy after the attacks of September 11th launched our nation in a "war" against terror.

It is more important than ever to speak up against unjust policies. There is much to be learned from my experience during World War II, as well as the experience of other groups about the destructive consequences of discrimination.

For over 60 years, it has been the U.S. military's official policy to exclude individuals based on their sexual orientation and gender identification. Reflecting one of our country's last officially sanctioned forms of bigotry, this policy stigmatizes patriotic Americans by excluding them from military service.

In 1993, President Clinton introduced the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy as a 'compromise' when he was not able to overcome Congressional opposition to lifting the ban on LGBT participation in the armed forces. Unfortunately, this policy works to silence LGBT personnel among the ranks of our military, making them invisible to the American public they bravely volunteer to protect and defend.

Notwithstanding the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, countless veterans have served and continue to serve selflessly in the defense of our nation. Yet while thousands of our men and women continually serve to protect our freedom and liberty and put their lives on the line to do so, many are dismissed once their orientation or identification becomes known.

This policy is not only unfair to LGBT individuals, it also hinders our military's ability to perform its mission. Despite our need for language specialists, almost 800 mission-critical troops and at least 59 Arabic and nine Farsi linguists have been discharged under "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" in the last five years solely based on their sexual orientation.

It is the right of all Americans to live open lives within society, free from prejudice, intolerance, and fear, irrespective of race, ethnicity, age and perceived sexual orientation and gender. The contributions made by LGBT veterans, and those in active duty in an atmosphere hostile to them, underscores the tremendous sacrifices they make to serve this nation and I commend and thank them for their commitment and perseverance.

I have the honor of knowing Ashwin Madaia, a former Marine Corps JAG officer now living in Minnesota, who was one of the first attorneys to successfully defend a fellow Marine from treatment under the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy and who told me about his work on this case. If convicted this Marine would have faced an "Other Than Honorable Discharge" and lost his benefits.

When this Marine returned to service, he was welcomed by his comrades and was treated with respect and honor. Sadly, since the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy went into effect in 1994, nearly 13,000 servicemembers were not as fortunate and were discharged.

Today there are over one million gay and lesbian veterans and over 65,000

LGBT members of the military serving in fear of being discharged for simply being themselves.

Repealing "Don't Ask Don't Tell" is long overdue. On this the military courts have spoken, military leaders have spoken, servicemembers have spoken, and our President has spoken. Today Congress is speaking as well. The Military Readiness Enhancement Act of 2009, H.R. 1283, has 176 cosponsors united and committed to ending this discriminatory policy.

It is time to support our troops by honoring their right to live and serve as their true selves. It's time to ask, it's time to tell, and it's time to get over it.

As policy makers, we are often faced with choices between what is urgent and what is important. But it's a false choice. The urgent issues of the day should never drown out what's important. Full equality for every person under the law is both urgent and important.

Thank you to our active military and to our veterans for their service to this great country. It is in your honor that this Congress will ensure every woman and man wishing to serve can do so, without fear or prejudice.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to end discrimination of LGBT people in the workplace and in our immigration policies as well expanding hate crimes to include perceived sexual orientation and gender identity and providing Federal recognition of the commitment between same-sex couples.

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, thank you, Congressman PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, for arranging this special order on ending the outdated and discriminatory policy of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell".

Thank you for taking up, H.R. 1283, which was originally introduced by our former colleague Congresswoman Ellen Tauscher.

I'm proud to serve as a vice chair along with several of my colleagues of the Congressional Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Equality Caucus which we established last year under the leadership of Congresswoman TAMMY BALDWIN and Chairman BARNEY FRANK.

We've made a lot of progress as a nation, in terms of society's recognition of the need to support basic fundamental human rights for all people—regardless of what their sexual orientation or gender identity happens to be.

I am pleased that we will finally take up legislation to extend hate crimes protections to the LGBT community.

However, we still have a long way to go to achieve the very simple and basic goal that we all seek—equal treatment for all under the law.

One critical step on the path to that goal is ending discrimination based on sexual orientation in our military.

The experience of our allies shows that having openly gay servicemembers does nothing to reduce the capability or effectiveness of the military. Our strongest allies have ended the ban in their militaries and have not suffered the exaggerated fears about weakening "unit cohesion" or lowering morale.

The misguided concerns about gays in the military, which precipitated the adoption of

"Don't Ask, Don't Tell" have proven to be completely unwarranted.

Our military served as a leader in ending discrimination and segregation of minority troops in their ranks and helped to lead the nation as a model of fairness.

It should do so again, by ending this policy and giving every American the opportunity to proudly and openly and equally serve their nation.

It makes no sense to kick out thousands of trained and capable soldiers even as recruits pay huge bonuses to find new recruits.

Just look at the numbers, since 1993:

Numbers of Don't Ask Don't Tell discharges—13,000;

"Mission Critical" soldiers discharged—800;

Arabic linguists discharged—58;

Estimated LGBT currently serving—65,000.

Fixing the clear discrimination of "Don't Ask Don't Tell" doesn't end the fight.

We've got to go further.

We must:

Pass the Employee Non-Discrimination Act;

Pass comprehensive immigration reform legislation that ends discrimination against the LGBT community;

We must ensure that federal benefits are extended to cover LGBT partners;

Repeal the Defense of Marriage Act.

Despite the challenges ahead, I know that as a nation, we will continue down the road of progress and equality under the law.

I will continue to do my part to support the rights of the LGBT community.

Let me, again, thank Congressman PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania for this important Special Order.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my support for the repeal of the Department of Defense's policy of "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" that bans openly gay men and women from serving in the military.

Under this law, our military loses on average one person a day, and since "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" became law in 1994, almost 13,000 servicemembers have been discharged. It is startling to think that we are allowing some incredibly qualified and thoroughly trained individuals to fall out of the armed services simply for being themselves. Honesty and integrity are two of our highest ideals, and the notion that our servicemembers sacrifice their personal integrity and capacity to be honest simply to serve our country seems unhealthy and hypocritical. At this time, the contributions of every service man and woman should be highly valued, and it is important that Americans embrace these openly gay individuals as equal and essential to our nation's armed services.

Furthermore, I believe that we must work towards ending discrimination against every racial, religious, and sexual minority. It is imperative that we create more opportunities for all Americans, rather than intensify existing divisions. "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" is discrimination at its very worst, and we must end this policy that violates the fundamental American values of fairness and equality.

Truly, this law does harm to so many individuals, and it is time to see its end. I ask my fellow colleagues to join me in supporting the repeal of the antiquated policy "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" so that our military can reach its highest potential.

VACATING 5-MINUTE SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the ordering of a 5-minute Special Order speech in favor of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is hereby vacated.

There was no objection.

HATE CRIMES LEGISLATION ATTACHED TO THE DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2009, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remaining time until midnight.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have listened to most of the last hour with great interest. I was owed the Army 4 years from a scholarship I had at Texas A&M. Most people my age can tell you exactly what their draft number was. I can't. I didn't care. I was going into the Army. I expected to go into Texas A&M and finish my 4 years, come out as a second lieutenant and end up in Vietnam, as many of my friends did. But Vietnam ended before I graduated. I spent 4 years in the Army. I asked on my dream sheet to be sent to Germany. So the Army sent me to Georgia, to Fort Benning. Pretty close. It begins with G-E.

We've heard many examples here of people saying, Well, gee, if gays are not allowed, they might not reenlist. If you listen to the current commanders of our U.S. military, you listen to the vast majority of the military, then they're concerned not about gays in the military but about openly gay individuals in the military. This isn't a debate. When we talk about Don't Ask, Don't Tell, it's not a debate about whether or not there will be people who practice homosexuality in the Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, Coast Guard. That's not the issue at all. There are people who practice homosexuality who are in the service, as my friends have already indicated.

The issue is, will they be allowed to be very openly practicing such things. The current policy is, if it's not where it's openly offensive to people who think it's inappropriate, then certainly we welcome your service in the military. It's just amazing where we are right now in America. You know, going back to last September, early October, we crammed a bailout bill down America that most Members hadn't had a chance to read. I read it. Then we come through with these stimulus bills, land omnibus bills, all this stuff that's coming down. And you just go, where have we gotten to in America? The military is not a social experiment. It's not. I think my friends know that. I heard one of the gentlemen across the aisle mention, Anything that distracts from the goals of the military should not be in the military. Whether it is heterosexual open acts or homosexual open acts, indications are it's a distraction.

So this isn't an issue about whether there will be gays in the military. It's about whether or not there will be people who are openly gay in the military. And still the commanders in the field seem to fairly uniformly indicate that it will be a problem for them completing their missions at maximum efficiency. That is what needs to be known. For every example of any individual saying, Gee, if gays are not allowed to be open in the military, I may not reenlist or I won't reenlist or I didn't, you have no idea how many people apparently have indicated, If the Don't Ask, Don't Tell is eliminated, I'm not joining. I'm not reenlisting. I'm about done with the social experimentation in the military. It's no place for it.

But, actually, it seems like this hour tonight follows, interestingly, just as a hate crimes bill has been added to the Defense authorization bill. Here we've got soldiers in harm's way needing us to authorize the money that they need to have the equipment and all that they need to protect us and to protect themselves, and we're playing games with them, attaching a hate crimes bill on a Defense authorization. Most people would say, Defense authorization is a must-pass piece of legislation, and therefore, people will be afraid to vote against it, especially conservatives, moderates. So you add a hate crimes bill to the Defense authorization? Are there no bounds to which this Congress will not stoop?

We can't just say to our military members, Here is what you need. Oh, no. We're going to go beyond Don't Ask, Don't Tell. We're going to stick a hate crimes bill on this bill and hold our soldiers, who are in the field trying to protect us, hostage unless you are willing to pass this hate crimes bill with what the soldiers need. It's just mind-boggling that people in positions of authority in this Congress would be willing to do that. It's just unbelievable.

Now, we have fought over this hate crimes bill in committee and on the floor and over and over. We made amendments, offered amendments because we could see that the definition of sexual orientation is wide open to all kinds of interpretation. And someday some court somewhere will say, You know what, sexual orientation means exactly what those words mean. If you're oriented—I hope it doesn't offend. But this is part of the law. It's laws in most States or it has been certainly in many States. If you're oriented toward animals, bestiality, then that is not something that could be held against you or any bias could be held against you for that, which means you would have to strike any laws against bestiality. If you're oriented toward corpses, toward children, there are all kinds of perversions—what most of us would call perversions. Some would say it sounds like fun, but most would say were perversions, and there have been laws against them.

□ 2310

This bill says whatever you are oriented towards sexually, that cannot be a source of bias against someone. Well, that's interesting.

Someone said, well, surely they didn't mean to include pedophiles or necrophiliacs or what most of us would say are perverse sexual orientations. But the trouble is we made amendments to eliminate pedophiles from being included in the definition. In fact, we made an amendment to use the definition in another part of Federal law that would have restricted sexual orientation to only talking about heterosexuality and homosexuality. We were willing to agree to that. But that also was voted down. The majority who is in control of Congress today made it very clear in committee, through rules, through the floor here, that they did not want any limits on sexual orientation on that definition.

"Gender identity," who knows what that will some day be interpreted to mean. There is no definition for that. It's whatever anybody wants to think it means. All of this stuff is just unbelievable.

We even went so far as to say, you know what? If you're going to try to protect transgender or homosexual individuals more than other people in society, then at least give the elderly that same protection. That amendment was voted down. We're not going to give the elderly the same heightened protection we would give transgender individuals, even though elderly are frequently picked out, targeted, because they're older and considered less able to protect themselves. If anybody deserved to be in that protected class, certainly the elderly would be. But this isn't about that. This is about forcing some type of sexual practices on those who are bothered by them on the country.

It's obviously not about run-away crime regarding hate crime that's just growing and growing. In the debate earlier today on this floor, the most we heard were statistics cited from 2007, and the reason for that is that the FBI statistics show that the numbers of hate crimes have been reduced over the last 20 and 10 years. They're going down. The laws in effect are carrying out their purpose.

Also, it should be noted that there is no act of violence that the Federal hate crimes bill covers that is not already a crime in every State in the Union. It makes no sense to hold our soldiers hostage to this hate crimes bill being added on there.

Now, when you look at the status of hate in America, there is hate in America. There is. And I don't know of anybody in this congressional body that likes the idea of hatred of one for another. It's not appropriate. Those of us who are Christians believe we are to love one another. In fact, when Jesus was asked what's the most important commandment, he said love God. The other is like it: Love each other. On

these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets: Love God and love each other. That's what a Christian is supposed to do.

Certainly, though, some people struggle with how anyone can love and care deeply about someone when they disagree strongly with the lifestyle that person is in. All I can suggest is that if someone is a true Christian, it's easier than you might imagine to love someone and totally object to a lifestyle.

But I keep hearing about how it's all about racial hatred. There is some racial hatred in this country. There's no question that there still is. But thank God that has been diminished tremendously over the years.

I am aware back in the 1980s, well over 20 years ago, I had some new neighbors move in. My wife and I and our three children, we had some neighbors move in. And we were excited because we had a doctor moving in next door. And I realized back in those days there still apparently is some feeling among some people of, gee, if somebody's of darker skin than I am, maybe I don't want them in our neighborhood.

That became apparent one night when I got a call from a neighbor who said, Did you know that our new neighbors who are living right next door to you are black? And I said, You know, we had them over here for dinner last night and I kept sitting there through dinner thinking, you know, there's something different about these people, and you know what? I think that's it. I believe you're right. I think they must be black.

Well, I was being sarcastic, for those who don't know sarcasm. As I told that neighbor, Look, I don't care what color he is. These are wonderful people. They're obviously going to be great neighbors, and I have a feeling someday he may save one of my kids. Who knows. Well, it turned out Larry Irvin did.

One night, my 5-year-old's fever spiked. I was not there. My wife was frantic, and she called Larry. He rushed over, got her in a tub of ice, got her temperature down. We didn't lose her. And I'll always be grateful that I had a neighbor, never mind that he happened to be African American. He was a wonderful person. I say "was" because we lost him. But a good man. But I realized from that phone call there are some people that still have these issues of race out there.

I've heard some people say that if you question our President because he happens to be black that you must be a racist. Well, that's kind of tough for me because I voted for Alan Keyes back in 1996. I never told Senator Gramm, but I liked the way Alan Keyes was able to articulate things that I believed in. I thought he was a fantastic candidate and would have made a great President back at that time. And so it would never have crossed my mind to think that those who countered Alan Keyes in 1996 must be racists. That didn't cross my mind.

So I'm very saddened when I hear somebody these days say if you're against our President, you must be a racist. That's ridiculous. Does that mean that everybody that disagreed with George W. Bush who is black was being a racist? I don't think so. So I hate to hear especially colleagues in here drag that up as being a motivation and we have to end racial hatred in America and this bill will be the way to do it.

I was very privileged to stand with dozens of African American Christian brothers and sisters who'd also been ordained, and they were so much more articulate than I am and could ever hope to be, but they were pointing out that it seems that the gay rights agenda attached its wagon, basically, to the racial movement, and now that they have arrived here in Washington, now the gay rights movement is attempting to tell them, as these African American ministers pointed out, they can't teach about what they believe and they believe the Bible teaches is sexual immorality.

Now, we have heard people on the floor here today say that this hate crimes bill is not about anything but violent acts, which I am sure they believe what they say, but it's simply not true. Not true at all.

□ 2320

Now, one good example, yes, it pertains to violent acts, and it does have a provision that some people stuck in here that says basically that nothing could be used that burdens a person's exercise of religion, speech, expression, or association—but unfortunately there's not a period there. There is an "unless." Well, that's what makes this worth little more than the paper it's written on unless the government demonstrates an application burden to the person is in furtherance of a compelling government interest.

Now, that's the key here—unless it is in furtherance of the compelling government interest—because you see, 18 U.S. Code 2 is the law of principles in the Federal law. Most States have a similar "law of principles," it's usually called, which means they're not really accomplices. Anybody that aids, abets, induces—that verb is in the Federal law—induces someone to commit a crime is just as guilty as if they perpetrated the crime. That's where this bill does so much damage to religious free speech.

And I brought this up because this has been debated in past Congresses, and I brought this up previously. What if a preacher preaching from a Bible, a rabbi teaching from the Tanach, or an imam preaching from the Koran were to say that homosexuality is just wrong in God's eyes and that such conduct merits punishment in God's eyes? Well, if some nut were to hear that and go out and commit an act of violence and he says, Well, you know, I heard these sermons or the teachings of the preacher, the rabbi, or the imam,

that's what induced me into doing it, would the preacher be protected or the rabbi?

And the answer is no, they would not be protected. And you can bet that under the right prosecutor that those individuals would have DVDs, CDs, sermon notes, anything that a prosecutor could get his hands on would certainly be shown to be in furtherance of a compelling government interest, that being whether or not he induced or incited the criminal act.

So that would be a very chilling effect on anyone who teaches or preaches such things in such religious formats. It's not protected. It's not protected.

And so imagine the incredible irony of having a Defense Authorization Bill to give our valiant defenders in harm's way what they need to protect us, and we add on a bill that will limit religious moral teaching. Just amazing. Just amazing.

Now, as an example of exactly how 18 U.S.C. 2A could be applied here. I wanted to give this example. Say the preacher specifically went to Romans 1, verse—well, let's see—let's start with 18. And this is the New King James version. And say a preacher were to stand up and just do nothing but read straight from the Bible, and this is verse 18, For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all the ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who suppress the truth in unrighteousness, because what may be known of God is manifest in them, for God has shown it to them.

For since the creation of the world, His invisible attributes are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made. Even as eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse, because although they knew God, they did not glorify him as God, nor were thankful but became futile in their thoughts and their foolish hearts were darkened. Professing to be wise, they became fools.

I love that part.

Professing to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like corruptible man and birds and four-footed animals and creeping things.

Therefore, God also gave them up to uncleanness in the lust of their hearts to dishonor their bodies among themselves, who exchanged the truth of God for the lie and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator who is blessed forever. Amen.

This is verse 26: For this reason God gave them up to vile passions. For even their women exchanged the natural use for what is against nature. Likewise also the men, leaving the natural use of the woman, burned in their lust for one another, men with men committing what is shameful and receiving in themselves the penalty of their error which was due.

Now, suppose a preacher is preaching from those verses and just reads those verses actually, and some nut hears

them. Even though the preacher didn't advocate violence, some nut hears that and goes out and commits an act of violence. Says, Well, it was that reading straight from the Bible of Romans 1 that the preacher did, that's what induced me to do this.

Well, you can bet this language will not protect that preacher.

We also know that there are many who believe and teach that—the Koran teaches that the penalty for homosexual conduct is death, of all things. And we know that in Iran, Ahmadinejad I believe had said they didn't have any people practicing homosexuality in Iran. Well, apparently not. I mean, they may kill them, for all we know.

But this is the United States of America, and we do—or used to—believe in religious freedom and the freedom to teach religious morality as it has been taught in the greatest book ever written.

But this hate crimes bill is going to take care of that for us. And how ironic that a movement that would allow a certain conduct to be of a more heightened protected class than even the elderly is going to be attached to the Defense Authorization Bill. It's just mind-boggling that we have stooped this far. It's just unbelievable.

Now, with regard to the hate crimes bill, it should also not be lost that when we talk about protected classes—I think the defense authorization did add the military as a protected class—but just the ability to go into a church and forcefully get a preacher's notes, DVDs, it's going to have a chilling effect. There's no question about it.

And in every country where Federal law has adopted laws like this, this has an extremely chilling effect. And I go back to what our friend Chuck Colson had pointed out earlier this year, and that is when you lose morality in a Nation, you create economic instability leading to economic chaos. And when you have economic chaos, it is tragic, but people have always been willing to give up their liberties, their freedoms, in order to gain economic stability.

□ 2330

It happened in 1920s and 1930s Germany. They gave up their liberties to gain economic stability, and they got a little guy with a mustache who was the ultimate hate-monger. And this is scary stuff we are doing here when we take away what has traditionally been an important aspect of moral teaching in America.

Now, some of the same people are all upset about the plaque I was trying to have added to Statuary Hall here. We filed a bill called the Church Act, and we had research done by the Congressional Research Service so there would be no question that it wasn't slanted one way or another, that it was all accurate according to the Congressional Research Service. It would simply educate people who do not understand that the term "separation of church and

State" is not in the Constitution. It was in a letter that was written by Thomas Jefferson.

But anyway, this is the language that's proposed in the bill to be on the plaque: "The first Christian church services in the Capitol"—that is the U.S. Capitol and again this is all researched by CRS, all accurate, but "The first Christian church services in the Capitol were held when the government moved to Washington in the fall of 1800. They were conducted in the Hall of the House in the north wing of the building. In 1801, the House moved the church services to temporary quarters in the south wing, called the 'Oven,' which it vacated in 1804, returning services to the north wing for 3 years. During church services, the Speaker's podium was used as the preacher's pulpit.

"Within a year of his inauguration, President Thomas Jefferson began attending church services in the Chamber of the House of Representatives. Throughout his administration, which was 1801 to 1809, Thomas Jefferson permitted and encouraged church services in the executive branch buildings. Sermons regarding the Old and New Testaments of the Bible were even conducted in the Supreme Court Chambers while the judicial branch was located in the old north wing of the Capitol.

"The term 'separation of church and State,' not found in the Constitution, was rather first used by Thomas Jefferson in a letter to the Danbury Baptists. Though Jefferson saw no problem about having nondenominational Christian services in government buildings, he affirmed that the government should not choose an official Christian denomination. The worship services in the government-owned House Chamber—a practice that continued until after the Civil War—were acceptable to Jefferson because they were non-discriminatory and voluntary.

"President James Madison, the recognized author of the Constitution, followed Jefferson's example. In keeping with Madison's understanding of the First Amendment, church services were permitted in the Halls of State on Sundays during his administration. That was 1809 to 1817. However, unlike Jefferson, who rode on horseback to attend church in the Capitol, Madison traveled in a coach pulled by four horses. The services were interrupted in 1814 after the interior was burned by the British and had to be repaired.

"Preachers of every Christian denomination preached Christian doctrine in this Chamber. On January 8, 1826, Bishop John England of Charleston, South Carolina, became the first Catholic clergyman to preach in the House of Representatives. The first woman to preach before the House, and likely the first woman to speak officially in Congress under any circumstances, was the English evangelist, Dorothy Ripley, who conducted a service on January 12, 1806."

So that is a history of the Christian movement, the Christian church being

very much a part of the early founding of this country and the early days. And we could have quote after quote. History is replete with them, of the role of the Judeo-Christian beliefs and the founding of this country. And, in fact, through the 1800s, most of the time, somebody proposed a bill, they liked the idea of having a Scripture to back it up. They thought that would help win the support of the other Members here.

And if you look at the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the 56 signers who pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor, between one-third and one-half of those signers were ordained Christian ministers. And they helped give us this great start.

The first Speaker of the House, Mr. Speaker, was a Christian minister, was Frederick Muhlenberg, originally from Pennsylvania, as was his brother, Peter, also a minister. But those were the early days.

So it was troubling that the Constitution, that incredible document that was not first established in 1783, that was Articles of Confederation, but then 1787 we got to the Constitutional Convention during which Benjamin Franklin was there. But all 13 colonies had made clear, we are only coming back if George Washington presides. He is the only one we trust. They talked Washington into coming back to the Constitutional Convention to preside. How much that says about an individual, that the 13 colonies would only trust this person. Washington came back. He presided. We got the Constitution.

But even then, after nearly 5 weeks, they had accomplished basically nothing. And that is when Benjamin Franklin stood up, was recognized by President Washington, president of the Constitutional Convention, and basically said, we've been going for nearly 5 weeks and we have accomplished virtually nothing. We have more "noes" than "ayes" on these votes. He said, When we met in this room during war with Great Britain, we had daily prayer in this room. How is it, sir, that we have not once called upon the Father of Lights to illuminate our understanding? He went on to say that if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without God taking notice, is it possible that an empire could rise without his aid?

He said, We are told in the sacred writing that unless the Lord builds the house, they labor in vain that build it. Firmly he said he believed that, not only that, but that without God's concurring aid, they would fare no better than the builders of Babel. He went on, spoke some more and ultimately made a motion that henceforth, every day of the Congress of the United States start with a prayer. From that day in 1787 until this very day, every session starts with prayer.

So that was very much a vital part of that. But we had a Constitution that

was the most incredible founding document of any country in the history of the world. It is tragic, also, that it did not come to mean the same thing that all people truly were equal for over 100 years, actually, until 18—well until the Civil War. And Lincoln was a devout Christian. He was a phenomenal theological thinker as evidenced by his second inaugural address that is etched in the north wall of the Lincoln Memorial.

That's why he came forth with the Emancipation Proclamation. That's why if you go back to his two brief years in the House of Representatives, Lincoln was supposedly asked after he was President, Did you ever remember anything occurring memorable during your brief time in the House of Representatives? And he had said nothing other than this; and, of course, history records that we had one President, after he was President, run for the House of Representatives, John Quincy Adams. He believed God was calling him to bring an end to slavery in the United States as a Christian in England had done who got elected in 1785, fought 20 years and finally had the repeal of the slave trade, that was William Wilberforce, the slave trade in 1805, then he fought for 28 more years and in 1833 slavery was outlawed completely in England.

John Quincy Adams felt that was his calling. That was something he felt he was supposed to do here in the United States, what Wilberforce was doing and had done in England.

And so after he was defeated by Andrew Jackson in 1828, he ran for the House of Representatives; 1830 he got elected. For 17 years that man preached on the evils of slavery, basically asking how could God bless America, continue to bless America when we are mistreating our brothers and sisters by putting them in chains and bondage. That was the church.

The church was all involved in the Underground Railroad in trying to protect slaves who were getting away because the churches recognized, and those who were really devout truly understood, they recognized them as being brothers and sisters and treated them accordingly.

□ 2340

And then you come even up to the civil rights movement in the 1960s, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., he was an ordained Christian minister. And there are many who believe in this country that all of his work, all of his effort, his peaceful protests, actually did one thing and that was get us closer to the day when people were judged by the content of their character rather than the color of their skin. But many think what he did was have African Americans in an atmosphere where they are treated more evenly. But he did something more. For white people who are Christians, he helped free them to be true Christians and treat every man and woman as brothers and sisters. He helped people across all races.

But he did believe in the Bible. He was quite the Christian evangelist preacher. So this movement has been throughout.

And now all of these years later we come to the point where there is going to be legislation. It has already been attached to the Defense Authorization bill. I guess that is to give people in the Senate protection who are afraid to vote because people back home may actually figure out that this is going to have a detrimental effect on the freedom to discuss immorality as the Bible teaches particularly, but certainly the Koran and the Tanach. And if you want to get right down to it, the term "sodomy" does come from the city of Sodom.

But this bill, the hate crimes bill, it will affect the ability of preachers to preach sexual immorality, as I have just read earlier from Romans 1, or to talk about, and both in the Koran and in what we call the Old Testament, the Tanach, the Torah, books in what we call the Old Testament and the Koran both talk about Sodom. Both talk about Gomorrah. Both talk about Lot and his family being there in Sodom. And both talk about the attraction of men for men, and that when the angels came there to Lot in Sodom, the men did not want Lot's daughters for sexual pleasure, they wanted the angels, and that was too much for God for those who believe the account as written out in the Old Testament.

But if this bill passes on the back of a Defense Authorization, a bill that is going to equip our soldiers to defend our freedoms and then take away religious freedom at the same time, it is amazing.

Something Chuck Colson said years ago was you cannot demand the morality of Woodstock and not expect a Columbine. If the morality of the country is if it feels good do it, at some point some warped soul is going to wonder about what it feels like to kill people and what it feels like to do other things.

What is really offensive to me, this hate crimes bill, on committee, on the floor, could have been amended, but the majority would not allow us to restrict the definition even of what sexual orientations were protected. They wanted it left. They wouldn't even restrict pedophilia, wouldn't restrict necrophilia, wouldn't restrict the other definitions of sexual orientation. They wanted it wide open. And for that, you are going to hook this on the backs of our soldiers and they don't get what they need in the field unless we pass this hate crimes bill into law.

How far have we come? How far have we come? There was a reason Jeremiah cried when he fell for his country.

We were promised the most open and fair, procedurally fair Congress in history before the 2006 election. What we have seen is the most closed, fewer amendments allowed. Even when the Republicans took the majority in 1995, in the 1994 election and then were

sworn in in 1995, they allowed open rules on their points of the Contract with America. It was openly debated, and yet this has been the most closed Congress.

So the only chance we have to discuss this is not in an amendment process, not on the bill itself that may be jointly in a conference report with nothing but the hate crimes bill. Oh, no, it is on the back of our soldiers and their money and supplies they need in their Defense Authorization.

This is not an open Congress. This is not what was promised. This is not what was on the Speaker's Web site for so long that would occur in this House. It is just sad.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CRENSHAW (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of a family medical issue.

Mr. HINOJOSA (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of official business and extended travel in district.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. QUIGLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ALTMIRE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. QUIGLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, October 7.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia, for 5 minutes, October 7.

Mr. POE of Texas, for 5 minutes, October 13.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INGLIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, October 13.

Mr. PENCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 251. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to permit targeted interference with mobile radio services within

prison facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition, to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to former Senator Edward Brooke, to the Committee on House Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Lorraine C. Miller, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3663. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to delay the date on which the accreditation requirement under the Medicare Program applies to suppliers of durable medical equipment that are pharmacies.

On Friday, October 2, 2009:

H.R. 1687. An act to designate the federally occupied building located at McKinley Avenue and Third Street, SW., Canton, Ohio, as the "Ralph Regula Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

H.R. 2053. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 525 Magoffin Avenue in El Paso, Texas, as the "Albert Armendariz, Sr., United States Courthouse".

H.R. 2121. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey a parcel of real property in Galveston, Texas, to the Galveston Historical Foundation.

H.R. 2498. An act to designate the Federal building located at 844 North Rush Street in Chicago, Illinois, as the "William O. Lipinski Federal Building".

H.R. 2913. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 301 Simonton Street in Key West, Florida, as the "Sidney M. Aronovitz United States Courthouse".

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced her signature on October 2, 2009, to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1289. An act to improve title 18 of the United States Code.

S. 1707. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2010 through 2014 to promote an enhanced strategic partnership with Pakistan and its people, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 7, 2009, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3960. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the

Department's final rule — Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Final Free and Reserve Percentages for 2008-09 Crop Natural (Sun-Dried) Seedless Raisins [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-08-0114; FV09-989-1 FIR] received September 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3961. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Kiwifruit Grown in California; Change in Reporting Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-08-0017; FV08-920-2 FR] received September 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3962. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vegetables, Import Regulations; Partial Exemption to the Minimum Grade Requirements for Fresh Tomatoes [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-08-0097; FV09-980-1 FR] received September 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3963. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Dried Prunes Produced in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-09-0048; FV09-993-1 IFR] received September 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3964. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Oranges, Grapefruit, Tangerines, and Tangelos Grown in Florida; Order Amending Marketing Order No. 905 [Doc. No.: AO-85-A10; AMS-FV-07-0132; FV08-905-1] received September 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3965. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Irish Potatoes Grown in Certain Designated Counties in Idaho, and Malheur County, Oregon and Imported Irish Potatoes; Relaxation of Size Requirements [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-08-0062; FV08-945-1 FR] received September 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3966. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule — Avermectin B1 and its delta-8,9-isomer; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2008-0806; FRL-8427-7] received August 27, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3967. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Private Security Contractors (PSCs) Operating in Contingency Operations [DOD-2008-OS-0125] (RIN: 0790-AI38) received September 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3968. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID FEMA-2008-0020; Internal Agency Docket No. FEMA-8087] received September 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3969. A letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC): Implementation of Nondiscretionary WIC Certification and General Administrative Provisions [FNS-2007-0009] received September 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3970. A letter from the Chief, Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC): Implementation of Nondiscretionary WIC Certification and General Administrative Provisions [FNS-2007-0009] (RIN: 0584-AD73) received September 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3971. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Vocational Rehabilitation Service Projects for American Indians with Disabilities [Docket ID ED-2009-OSERS-0008] (RIN: 1820-AB63) received September 8, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3972. A letter from the Acting Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Vaulting and Paying Benefits received September 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3973. A letter from the Department Director, Regulations Policy And Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Charging for Investigational Drugs Under an Investigational New Drug Application [Docket No.: FDA-2006-N-0237] (formerly Docket No.: 2006N-0061) (RIN: 0910-AF13) received September 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3974. A letter from the Dep. Dir., Regulations Policy and Mgmt. Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Microbiology Devices; Reclassification of Herpes Simplex Virus Types 1 and 2 Serological Assays [Docket No.: FDA-2009-N-0344] received September 14, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3975. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District [EPA-R09-OAR-2009-0079; FRL-8945-1] received September 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3976. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District and Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2009-0385; FRL-8948-6] received September 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3977. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Final DTV Table of Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Boise, Idaho) [MB Docket No.: 09-96] received September 11, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3978. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Prohibitions on Market Manipulation [Project No. P082900] (RIN: 3084-AB12) received September 15, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3979. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary For Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to Certain End-User Controls under the Export Administration Regulations; Clarification Regarding License Requirements for Transfers (in-country) to Persons Listed on the Entity List [Docket No.: 090126062-91139-01] (RIN: 0694-AE54) received September 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3980. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Deep-Sea Red Crab Fishery; Emergency Rule; Extension [Docket No.: 090206152-9249-01] (RIN: 0648-AX61) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3981. A letter from the Assistant Secretary — Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Geological and Geophysical (G&G) Explorations of the Outer Continental Shelf—Changing Proprietary Term of Certain Geophysical Information [Docket ID: MMS-2008-OMM-0006] (RIN: 1010-AD41) received September 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3982. A letter from the Assistant Secretary — Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Technical Changes to Production Measurement and Training Requirements [Docket ID MMS-2008-OMM-0023] (RIN: 1010-AD55) received September 3, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3983. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Teledyne Continental Motors (TCM) IO-520, TSIO-520, and IO-550 Series Reciprocating Engines with Superior Air Parts, Inc. (SAP) Cylinder Assemblies Installed [Docket No.: FAA-2007-0051; Directorate Identifier 2007-NE-37-AD; Amendment 39-15986; AD 2009-16-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 12, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3984. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. TPE331-10 and TPE331-11 Series Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0555; Directorate Identifier 2009-NE-18-AD; Amendment 39-15996; AD 2009-17-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3985. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Model BAe 146 and Avro 146-RJ Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0532; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-024-AD; Amendment 39-15994; AD 2009-17-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3986. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Plentywood, MT [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0225; Airspace Docket No. 09-ANM-4] received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3987. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness

Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Limited Model PC-7 Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2009-0509; Directorate Identifier 2009-CE-029-AD; Amendment 39-15985; AD 2009-16-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 21, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3988. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Modification of Revenue Procedure 2007-44 (Rev. Proc. 2009-36) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3989. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Revocation of Elections By Multiemployer Defined Benefit Pension Plans to Freeze Funded Status under section 204 of WRERA (Revenue Procedure 2009-43) received September 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3990. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Program allowing Department of Treasury to partner with private investors to form public-private investment partnerships to acquire legacy securities (Rev. Proc. 2009-42) received September 10, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3991. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Information Reporting of Discharges of Indebtedness (RIN: 1545-BH99) received September 16, 2009, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Resolution 719. Resolution commending Russ Meyer on his induction into the National Aviation Hall of Fame; with an amendment (Rept. 111-282). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 138. Resolution recognizing the 40th anniversary of the George Bush Intercontinental Airport in Houston, Texas (Rept. 111-283). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3371. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to improve airline safety and pilot training, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Resolution 465. Resolution recognizing the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway Association on the occasion of its 10th anniversary, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 111-285). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. OBERSTAR: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Resolution 3305. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 224 South Boulder Avenue in Tulsa, Oklahoma, as the "H. Dale Cook Federal Building and United States Courthouse" (Rept. 111-286). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 799. Resolution providing

for consideration of the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2997) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2010, and for other purposes (Rept. 111-287). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BUYER (for himself and Mr. MICHAUD):

H.R. 3719. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a Veterans Economic Opportunity Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HARE (for himself, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, and Mr. BOWWELL):

H.R. 3720. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate a rule to improve the daytime and nighttime visibility of agricultural equipment that may be operated on a public road; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. NADLER of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. CHU, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. HOLT, Mr. HARE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. SESTAK):

H.R. 3721. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to clarify the appropriate standard of proof; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIRKPATRICK of Arizona:

H.R. 3722. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the New Markets Venture Capital and Renewable Fuel Capital Investment Programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. HALVORSON:

H.R. 3723. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to improve the activities carried out under section 7(a) of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. BERKLEY (for herself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3724. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the tip tax credit to employers of cosmetologists and to promote tax compliance in the cosmetology sector; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE (for himself and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 3725. A bill to relieve traffic congestion; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN:

H.R. 3726. A bill to establish the Castle Nugent National Historic Site at St. Croix, United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. POLIS, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 3727. A bill to enhance the ability of drinking water utilities in the United States to develop and implement climate change adaptation programs and policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 3728. A bill to make certain improvements in the laws applicable to the detention of individuals at United States detention facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Intelligence (Permanent Select), for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HERGER:

H.R. 3729. A bill to amend section 31 of the Small Business Act with respect to awarding contract opportunities to qualified HUBZone small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3730. A bill to provide for financial literacy education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. SIREs, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WU, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. BACA, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. REYES, Mr. ORTIZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PERRIELLO, Mr. TEAGUE, and Mr. HEINRICH):

H.R. 3731. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy, in coordination with the Secretary of Labor, to establish a program to provide for workforce training and education, at community colleges, in sustainable energy; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MITCHELL (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

H.R. 3732. A bill to prohibit an agency or department of the United States from establishing or implementing an internal policy that discourages or prohibits the selection of a resort or vacation destination as the location for a conference or event, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SESTAK:

H.R. 3733. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to expand the eligibility of members of the Armed Forces to participate in programs of higher education offered by the Community College of the Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SIREs (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. MCMAHON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DAVIS of Alabama, Mr. COHEN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 3734. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish and carry out an urban revitalization and livable communities program to provide Federal grants to urban areas for the rehabilitation of critically needed recreational areas and facilities and development of improved recreation programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial

Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas):

H.R. 3735. A bill to authorize and request the President to award the Medal of Honor posthumously to Captain Emil Kapaun of the United States Army for acts of valor during the Korean War; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H. Con. Res. 194. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "Lights On Afterschool!", a national celebration of after-school programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California:

H. Con. Res. 195. Concurrent resolution honoring the service and sacrifice of members of the United States Armed Forces who are serving in, or have served in, Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHADEGG:

H. Res. 796. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that no American should be penalized for failing to purchase Government-mandated health coverage; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CLARKE (for herself, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. WU, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. HIMES, Ms. KILROY, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. RICHARDSON, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, and Ms. FUDGE):

H. Res. 797. A resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to raising awareness and enhancing the state of cyber security in the United States, and supporting the goals and ideals of the sixth annual National Cyber Security Awareness Month; to the Committee on Science and Technology.

By Mr. McDERMOTT (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. ACKERMAN):

H. Res. 798. A resolution conveying the best wishes of the House of Representatives to those celebrating Diwali; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CAO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CHU, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BACA, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SIREs, Mr. HONDA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. INGLIS, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. WU):

H. Res. 800. A resolution expressing sympathy for the citizens of the Philippines deal-

ing with Tropical Storm Ketsana and Typhoon Parma; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE (for himself, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 801. A resolution expressing congratulations and support for the appointment of former President William J. Clinton as United Nations Special Envoy for Haiti, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SESTAK (for himself and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H. Res. 802. A resolution recognizing the commencement of the 9th year of Operation Enduring Freedom and the sacrifice and contributions of United States service members and their families in support of Operation Enduring Freedom; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SPACE (for himself and Mr. TERRY):

H. Res. 803. A resolution expressing the support of the House of Representatives regarding the merits and benefits of the Laundry Environmental Stewardship Program (ESP) program, which improves the environment through textile services industry wide conservation of water and energy, reducing pollutants, and using safer surfactants; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 13: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.

H.R. 25: Mr. HALL of Texas and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 29: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 86: Mr. CHAFFETZ.

H.R. 124: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 197: Mr. HARPER, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 198: Mr. PITTS.

H.R. 305: Mr. HEINRICH.

H.R. 406: Mr. ARCURI, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. CARDOZA, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Ms. BEAN, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.

H.R. 453: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 510: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 571: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. BOCCIERI.

H.R. 574: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 597: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 614: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 616: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 621: Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 624: Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 635: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 678: Mr. NYE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. SIREs.

H.R. 690: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 789: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.

H.R. 840: Mr. SESTAK.

H.R. 881: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 916: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CHANDLER, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 958: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 988: Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 995: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 1021: Mr. ALTMIRE.

H.R. 1067: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

- H.R. 1074: Ms. MARKEY of Colorado and Mr. HARPER.
- H.R. 1079: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. SCHIFF.
- H.R. 1093: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
- H.R. 1101: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 1126: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 1166: Ms. RICHARDSON.
- H.R. 1188: Mr. PUTNAM.
- H.R. 1190: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 1205: Mr. DONNELLY of Indiana.
- H.R. 1207: Ms. CHU, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. DRIEHAUS.
- H.R. 1227: Mr. SHERMAN.
- H.R. 1230: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
- H.R. 1237: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 1278: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
- H.R. 1298: Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. TIERNEY.
- H.R. 1303: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
- H.R. 1339: Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut.
- H.R. 1362: Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
- H.R. 1407: Mr. MARSHALL.
- H.R. 1428: Ms. DEGETTE.
- H.R. 1447: Mr. WOLF.
- H.R. 1505: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
- H.R. 1528: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 1530: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 1531: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 1547: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan.
- H.R. 1570: Mr. MACK.
- H.R. 1625: Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. DENT, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. SHADEGG, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 1646: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
- H.R. 1691: Mr. KISSELL and Mr. YARMUTH.
- H.R. 1693: Mr. FARR.
- H.R. 1708: Mr. ORTIZ.
- H.R. 1722: Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. DOGGETT.
- H.R. 1740: Mr. COSTA, Mr. SPACE, and Mr. KUCINICH.
- H.R. 1769: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois.
- H.R. 1778: Mrs. HALVORSON.
- H.R. 1796: Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 1820: Ms. WATERS, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FARR, Ms. CHU, Ms. SPEIER, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
- H.R. 1826: Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HARMAN, and Mr. MURPHY of New York.
- H.R. 1835: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
- H.R. 1875: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
- H.R. 1884: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. DENT, and Ms. CHU.
- H.R. 1891: Mr. PITTS.
- H.R. 1894: Mr. GONZALEZ.
- H.R. 1912: Mr. SESTAK.
- H.R. 1927: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 1977: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 1995: Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 2017: Mr. COLE, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. WAMP, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
- H.R. 2055: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 2060: Mr. LUJÁN.
- H.R. 2067: Mr. COSTELLO and Mr. ACKERMAN.
- H.R. 2135: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
- H.R. 2149: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Ms. BALDWIN.
- H.R. 2190: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
- H.R. 2194: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. NYE, and Ms. TSONGAS.
- H.R. 2198: Mrs. BIGGERT.
- H.R. 2254: Mr. MELANCON, Mr. MILLER of North Carolina, Mr. CARDOZA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. AUSTRIA, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. SHULER.
- H.R. 2262: Mr. COSTELLO and Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN.
- H.R. 2269: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.
- H.R. 2279: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 2280: Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. PETERSON.
- H.R. 2324: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California.
- H.R. 2358: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 2377: Mr. CARDOZA and Mr. LATOURETTE.
- H.R. 2381: Mr. DEFAZIO.
- H.R. 2418: Mr. SESTAK.
- H.R. 2425: Ms. SPEIER, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 2427: Mr. DOGGETT.
- H.R. 2452: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. MINNICK.
- H.R. 2476: Mr. GALLEGLY.
- H.R. 2493: Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. SOUDER.
- H.R. 2499: Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. TERRY.
- H.R. 2515: Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.
- H.R. 2517: Ms. CHU.
- H.R. 2527: Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 2567: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. PETRI.
- H.R. 2597: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
- H.R. 2607: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 2625: Mr. WU.
- H.R. 2628: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
- H.R. 2642: Mr. TURNER.
- H.R. 2648: Mr. CLEAVER.
- H.R. 2655: Mr. LATOURETTE.
- H.R. 2730: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 2732: Mr. FORBES.
- H.R. 2740: Mr. GRIJALVA.
- H.R. 2746: Mr. BRALEY of Iowa and Ms. RICHARDSON.
- H.R. 2753: Mr. PITTS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
- H.R. 2766: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey and Mr. BERMAN.
- H.R. 2807: Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. DOGGETT.
- H.R. 2831: Ms. BALDWIN.
- H.R. 2842: Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. BLUNT.
- H.R. 2868: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 2879: Mr. MINNICK and Mr. WALZ.
- H.R. 2897: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HILL, Mr. COSTA, Mr. WILSON of Ohio, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
- H.R. 2935: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. POMEROY.
- H.R. 2936: Ms. SUTTON.
- H.R. 2964: Ms. TITUS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TERRY, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, and Mr. SCALISE.
- H.R. 3011: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.
- H.R. 3012: Ms. CHU.
- H.R. 3015: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.
- H.R. 3035: Mr. COHEN and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
- H.R. 3043: Mr. FARR, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. WATERS, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. MASSA.
- H.R. 3050: Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
- H.R. 3075: Mr. SESTAK.
- H.R. 3077: Mr. OLVER.
- H.R. 3078: Ms. DELAULO and Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 3105: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
- H.R. 3116: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WAMP, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
- H.R. 3186: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 3202: Mr. KAGEN.
- H.R. 3217: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
- H.R. 3238: Mr. ORTIZ.
- H.R. 3245: Ms. CHU, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. LEE of California.
- H.R. 3258: Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 3271: Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 3286: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, and Ms. KAPTUR.
- H.R. 3312: Ms. TITUS.
- H.R. 3328: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
- H.R. 3348: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WOLF, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. COLE, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. CARTER, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mr. OLSON.
- H.R. 3365: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ALTMIRE, Mr. BACA, and Mr. MASSA.
- H.R. 3375: Mr. WAMP.
- H.R. 3385: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
- H.R. 3408: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. WALZ, Ms. SUTTON, and Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 3413: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. MICHAUD.
- H.R. 3421: Mr. HONDA and Ms. RICHARDSON.
- H.R. 3430: Mr. CLEAVER.
- H.R. 3441: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
- H.R. 3480: Mrs. LOWEY.
- H.R. 3502: Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. MASSA.
- H.R. 3518: Mr. WILSON of Ohio and Mr. ALTMIRE.
- H.R. 3545: Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 3549: Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
- H.R. 3554: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
- H.R. 3569: Mr. HALL of Texas.
- H.R. 3571: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.
- H.R. 3585: Mrs. BONO MACK and Mr. HEINRICH.
- H.R. 3590: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. PLATTIS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 3608: Mr. WU, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. FILNER.
- H.R. 3610: Mr. PENCE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. CALVERT.
- H.R. 3613: Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. PETRI.
- H.R. 3633: Mr. WELCH.
- H.R. 3636: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. HINCHEY.
- H.R. 3644: Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. RICHARDSON.
- H.R. 3650: Mr. FARR, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. CAPUANO.
- H.R. 3668: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.
- H.R. 3670: Mr. SNYDER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SOUDER, and Ms. RICHARDSON.
- H.R. 3677: Mr. WAMP and Mr. HALL of Texas.
- H.R. 3679: Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 3696: Mr. PENCE.
- H.R. 3710: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
- H.R. 3712: Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
- H. J. Res. 26: Mr. LATOURETTE.
- H.J. Res. 47: Mr. MOLLOHAN.
- H. Con. Res. 18: Mr. CULBERSON.

H. Con. Res. 144: Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H. Con. Res. 147: Ms. RICHARDSON.
 H. Con. Res. 158: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. MOORE of Kansas.
 H. Con. Res. 169: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Ms. JENKINS.
 H. Con. Res. 170: Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. CAO, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H. Con. Res. 177: Mr. ROONEY and Mr. COSTELLO.
 H. Res. 159: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. BISHOP of New York.
 H. Res. 185: Mr. HALL of New York and Ms. RICHARDSON.
 H. Res. 252: Mr. ISSA and Mr. BILBRAY.
 H. Res. 395: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Res. 416: Mr. PAYNE.
 H. Res. 480: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H. Res. 516: Mr. WOLF.
 H. Res. 531: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SCHOCK, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. KILDEE.
 H. Res. 554: Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MACK, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. TEAGUE, Mr. JORDAN of Ohio, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. BOOZMAN.
 H. Res. 567: Ms. LEE of California.
 H. Res. 568: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. HARPER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. COFFMAN of Colorado,

Mr. COLE, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. INGLIS, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COBLE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. DAVIS of Kentucky, Mr. LANCE, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. MCCARTHY of California, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DENT, Mr. AKIN, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. ISSA, and Mr. TIAHRT.
 H. Res. 603: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
 H. Res. 614: Mr. MINNICK.
 H. Res. 630: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.
 H. Res. 650: Mr. COOPER, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. PETRI, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. CAO, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. INGLIS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. Chaffetz, Mr. HUNTER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. Posey, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H. Res. 660: Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H. Res. 700: Mr. HARE.
 H. Res. 704: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, and Mr. LATHAM.
 H. Res. 707: Mr. MAFFEI, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H. Res. 716: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Ms. CLARKE.
 H. Res. 727: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DENT, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. TURNER, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, and Mr. PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 729: Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JONES, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H. Res. 736: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MURTHA, and Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey.
 H. Res. 741: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
 H. Res. 748: Mr. PITTS.
 H. Res. 749: Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California.
 H. Res. 752: Mr. TONKO.
 H. Res. 763: Mr. FORBES.
 H. Res. 780: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BILBRAY, Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CHU, Mr. HONDA, Mr. AUSTRIA, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. WU.
 H. Res. 782: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MARKEY of Massachusetts, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. BARROW.
 H. Res. 783: Mr. CAO, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California, and Mr. SHULER.
 H. Res. 787: Mr. PETERS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mrs. HALVORSON, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. DAHLKEMPER, Mr. SNYDER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. RICHARDSON, and Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H. Res. 789: Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H. Res. 790: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
 H. Res. 793: Mr. GORDON of Tennessee, Mr. ROTHMAN of New Jersey, Ms. RICHARDSON, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WU, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland.